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BIMO What?

- What is for? Purpose
**What is for? Purpose**

- **FDA granted the right to audit clinical research sites**
- **Specifications for Preparing and Submitting Summary Level Clinical Site Data for CDER’s Inspection Planning**
- **CDER BIMO Technical Conformance Guide (v1)**
- **CDER BIMO Technical Conformance Guide (v2)**

**Timeline**
- 1977: FDA granted the right to audit clinical research sites
- 2011: FDA granted the right to audit clinical research sites
- Feb 2018: CDER BIMO Technical Conformance Guide (v1)
- Jul 2020: CDER BIMO Technical Conformance Guide (v2)

**Bioresearch Monitoring (BIMO) Program**, which created guidelines for agency inspections of clinical trial sites

**Applicable to NDA and certain BLA only**

**Source:** "Bioresearch Monitoring (BIMO) Fiscal Year 2020 Metrics" – FDA Presentation
BIMO TCG Technical Details

- Content
- Individual Subjects Line Listings
- Site Level Dataset (clinsite.xpt)
- Documentation
- Planning
- eCTD
Specifications for preparing and submitting information for planning of Bioresearch Monitoring (BIMO) inspections.

I. Clinical Study Level Information
- Studies Inventory
- Sites/Investigators locations
- Financial information
- Other study documents in eCTD study folder

II. Subject-Level Data Line Listings by Clinical Site
- Organized by Investigator site, listing type

III. Summary-Level Clinical Site Dataset
- clinsite.xpt
- summary by study, investigator site, by arm
- Site variables from I.
- 39 standard variables in appendix
- define-xml (pdf)
- Reviewer guide (optional)

Data from all Pivotal Studies
Individual Subjects Line Listings - By Clinical Site

- Subject-level data line listings provided for each major pivotal study
- For clinical investigator sites involved in multiple studies, subject listings should be provided independently for each study
- Details about the listings are provided in Bioresearch Monitoring Technical Conformance Guide
- PDF format
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consented Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Treatment Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disposition / Discontinuations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Study Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adverse Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Important Protocol Deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Efficacy Endpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Concomitant Medications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other Safety Data e.g., Labs, Ecg, Vital Signs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual Subjects Line Listings - By Clinical Site [Key Topics]
**Individual Subjects Line Listings - By Clinical Site [Possible Issues]**

- 500 MB max file size, if more split
- Generate empty listings when no data are available e.g., no important protocol violations for a site
- If a site has multiple investigators use the most recent
Site Level Dataset (clinsite.xpt)

- One record per Pivotal Study per Clinical Site per Treatment/Arm per Endpoint
- Standard Set of Variables (39)

**Study Level**
- STUDYID, TITLE, SPONCNT, SPONSOR, IND, UNDERIND, NDA, BLA, SUPPNUM, SITEID, ARM, COHORT

**Safety & Primary Endpoint**
- SAFPOP, SCREEN, DISCSTUD, DISCRTRT, ENDPOINT, ENDPTYPE, TRTEFFR, TRTEFFS, CENSOR, NSAE, SAE, DEATH, IMPDEV, NOIMPDEV

**Site & Investigator**
- FINLDISC, LASTNAME, FRSTNAME, MINITIAL, PHONE, FAX, EMAIL, COUNTRY, STATE, CITY, POSTAL, STREET, STREET1
## Site Level Dataset (clinsite.xpt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Index</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Variable Label</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes or Description</th>
<th>Sample Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STUDYID</td>
<td>Study Identifier</td>
<td>Char</td>
<td>Study or trial identification number.</td>
<td>ABC-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Char</td>
<td>Title of the study as listed in the clinical study report (limit 200 characters). If the title exceeds 200 characters, provide shortened title and define (e.g., use the abbreviated title from clinicaltrials.gov).</td>
<td>Double blind, randomized, placebo-controlled clinical study on the influence of drug X on indication Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SPONCNT</td>
<td>Sponsor Count</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Total count of sponsors throughout the study. If there was a change in the sponsor while the study was ongoing, with sponsors as defined in § 312.3 (21 CFR 312.3), enter an additional indication of the total count of sponsors.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SAFPOP</td>
<td>Number of Subjects in Safety Population</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Total number of subjects in safety population at a given site by treatment arm. When a subject has transferred from one site to another, the applicant should handle reporting of such subjects consistently across sites and include in the define the reporting convention used. The applicant may opt to further explain the reasons subjects transferred between sites in the BIMO Reviewer's Guide, if a guide will be provided.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SCREEN</td>
<td>Number of Subjects Screened</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Total number of subjects screened (and consented) at a given site (overall number per site as subjects have not yet been assigned to treatment arm). When a subject has transferred from one site to another, the applicant should handle reporting of such subjects consistently across sites and include the reporting convention used in the define file or the BIMO Reviewer's Guide (if provided). The applicant may opt to further explain the reasons subjects transferred between sites in the BIMO Reviewer's Guide, if provided.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>DISCSTUD</td>
<td>Number of Subjects</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Number of subjects in the safety population who discontinued from the study by treatment arm at a given site or measurement change.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>FINLDISC</td>
<td>Financial Disclosure Amount</td>
<td>Char</td>
<td>Total financial disclosure amount (US$) by site calculated as the sum of disclosures for the clinical investigator and all sub-investigators, to include all required parties under the applicable regulations (21 CFR 54, 312, 314, 320, 330, 601, 807, 812, 814, and 880). Enter ‘&gt;=$25,000,’ ‘&lt;= $25,000,’ ‘unknown’ if a proper value is applicable but is not known (i.e., unable to obtain information from investigator at site), or ‘masked’ if information on this item is available but it has not been provided by the vendor due to security, privacy, or other reasons.</td>
<td>&gt;= $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>LASTNAME</td>
<td>Investigator Last Name</td>
<td>Char</td>
<td>Last name of the clinical investigator as it appears on the Form FDA 1572 or the signed investigator agreement. At sites where the clinical investigator has changed during the course of the study the most recent clinical investigator.</td>
<td>Doe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Study Level Variables

### Safety & Primary Endpoint Level Variables

### Site and Investigator Level Variables
Site Level Dataset (clinsite.xpt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDYID</th>
<th>SITEID</th>
<th>ARM</th>
<th>SAFPOP</th>
<th>SCREEN</th>
<th>ENDPOINT</th>
<th>ENDPTYPE</th>
<th>TRTEFF</th>
<th>TRTEFFS</th>
<th>NSAE</th>
<th>SAE</th>
<th>DEATH</th>
<th>PROT/VOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>3.5 mg/kg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Qualifying relapse rate at 96 weeks</td>
<td>DISCRETE</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>5.25 mg/kg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Qualifying relapse rate at 96 weeks</td>
<td>DISCRETE</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Qualifying relapse rate at 96 weeks</td>
<td>DISCRETE</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.0615523128088</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Qualifying relapse rate at 96 weeks</td>
<td>DISCRETE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study/Site/Arm/Endpoint

Study Population Summary

Study Endpoint

Simple Summary Statistics

Key Safety Summary

- DISCRETE
- CONTINUOUS
- TIME-TO-EVENT
- OTHER
Site Level Dataset (clinsite.xpt) – Issues & Challenges

- Trial and Site information not in SDTM → Propose a template to sponsor
  - It includes 22 variables
  - Agree a template
  - Plan a Test Delivery
- Special characters (non-ASCII) not allowed in xpt e.g.,
  - FINLDISC (Financial Disclosure Amount): ≥ $50,000 → >= $50,000
Documentation [define-xml]

- Only for clinsite.xpt
- Pinnacle21 Enterprise Template
- Key Metadata - CLINSITE/Summary-Level Clinical Site Dataset
  - Standard Name: FDA Bioresearch Monitoring, v1.0
  - Class: SPECIAL PURPOSE
  - Structure: One record per study, site, arm and primary endpoint
  - Purpose: Analysis
  - Key Variables: STUDYID, SITEID, ARM, ENDPOINT
  - 40 Variables, no VLMs
  - 21 P21 Conformance Rules
- Reviewer Guide (optional for now)
Documentation - BIMO PHUSE working Group

https://advance.phuse.global/display/WEL/%28BIMO%29+Bio-research+Monitoring+Data+Reviewers+Guide


➢ Public review projected for 15th December 2021 to 31st January 2022.
Planning – Write a mini-SAP

- Planned Studies
- List of Listings
  - Key Instructions for Programmers
  - Ad-hoc derivations
  - List of Variables to be included
  - Reference to CSR listings if applicable
  - Decide how they will be organized, by subject vs by listings
- clinsite.xpt
  - Identify study endpoints e.g., efficacy
  - Specify type of endpoint e.g., continuous vs binary vs time to event
eCTD

- The three items should be placed in eCTD Module 5
- Module 5.3.5.4 with specific “BIMO” study tagging file (STF)

Module 5 clinical Study Reports

- 5.3 Clinical Study Reports
- 5.3.5 Reports of Efficacy and Safety Studies
- 5.3.5.1 Study Reports of Controlled Clinical Studies
Sponsor(s) Experience

- Sponsors Sharing their BIMO Experience
- Cytel Sponsor(s) Experience
Sponsors Sharing their BIMO Experience

- Pfizer 2018
- Janssen 2019
- Merck & Co 2019
- Vertex 2020
- Regeneron Pharmaceuticals 2021

See “References” Slide
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Number of and Type of Trials</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 [2016] Pain</td>
<td>2 Pivotal Ph III/Ph II</td>
<td>Only Listings; FDA Request post submission *ClinSite not provided (pilot not mandatory at that time)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 [2018] Neurology</td>
<td>2 Pivotal Ph III</td>
<td>define.xml; No reviewer Guide; By Site, Listings *ClinSite with Efficacy Data, Binary. Site Treatment Effect Size*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 [2019] Neurology</td>
<td>1 Pivotal Ph III</td>
<td>define.pdf; No reviewer Guide; By Site, Listings *ClinSite with Efficacy Data, Continuous. Site Treatment Effect Size*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 [2020] Multiple Sclerosis</td>
<td>3 Ph II, 2 Ph III, 1 Ph IV</td>
<td>define-xml / define.pdf; No reviewer Guide; By Site, Listings *ClinSite with Efficacy Data, Continuous / Binary Old Studies, Cytel not involved in the Submission*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 [2021] Oncology</td>
<td>1 Pivotal Ph III</td>
<td>define-xml; Reviewer Guide; By Site, Listings *ClinSite with Efficacy Data, Binary Old Studies, Cytel not involved in the Submission*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [2021] Fertility</td>
<td>3 Pivotal Ph III, 1 Bioequivalence</td>
<td>define-xml / define.pdf; Reviewer Guide; By Site, Listings *ClinSite with Efficacy Data, Continuous / Binary Discussed during FDA meeting (SDSP)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cytel Sponsor(s) Experience – Unnecessary Effort

From BIMO TCG

Treatment Efficacy Result (TRTEFFR) — The summary statistic for each primary efficacy endpoint, by treatment arm at a site. Values reported in TRTEFFR generally reflect simple summary statistics for the primary efficacy endpoint(s).

Sponsor 3 → endless discussion on PROC MIXED model to apply for Lsmeans calculation, this is not needed!!!

Site-Specific Treatment Effect variables also removed from TCG Version 2

- Site-Specific Treatment Effect (SITEEFFE) — The treatment effect should be reported using the same representation as reported for the primary efficacy analysis.
- Site-Specific Treatment Effect Standard Deviation (SITEEFFS) — The standard deviation of the SITEEFFE. The method used to calculate standard of deviation should be included in the data define table.
BIMO - Conclusions
BIMO - Conclusions

➢ Plan ahead, **it is not optional.** Integrate into submission activity priorities

➢ Get confirmation from the reviewer (SDSP)

4.4 BIMO Outputs

Also plans to submit the following information that will be used by the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) for planning of Bioresearch Monitoring (BIMO) inspections in electronic format:

I. Clinical Study-Level Information
II. Subject-Level Data Line Listings by Clinical Site
III. Summary-Level Clinical Site Dataset

This will be provided for the two studies that will be pooled into the ISS/ISE, study [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], as well as for [REDACTED] (Bioequivalence Study).

For item III a define-xml and a light reviewer guide will be provided in the submitted package.

➢ Re-use existing study material e.g., ADaM, CSR listing programs

➢ Standardize the process

➢ Future: FDA using “our” SDTM/ADaM to generate BIMO elements?
Data Submission News
Data Submission News – FDA Technical Rejection Criteria for Study Data

https://www.fda.gov/media/100743/download

➢ Version 1 released January 2019

➢ Few Criteria so far

➢ Presence of ts.xpt also for legacy studies if legacy datasets submitted

➢ eCTD STF file-tag matching STUDYID in submitted datasets

➢ Presence of dm.xpt if TS.SSTDTC>2016-12-16*

➢ Presence of adsl.xpt if TS.SSTDTC>2016-12-16 when ADaM is submitted*

➢ Presence of dm.xpt if TS.SSTDTC>2016-12-16

➢ September 15, 2021 Final Implementation

* Presence of define-xml
A Recent Sponsor/Cytel Experience

- Datasets submitted prior to September 15, 2021
- Several SDTM/ADaM Packages submitted for the same study e.g., key study endpoint analysis at 24, 48, 72 months
- Re-submission after September 15
- Sponsor got a “Rejection Notification”
Due to several study folders created for the same study, the STUDYID was not matching the eCTD STF file-tag.

Solution in the FDA TCG “7.1 eCTD Specifications”

The study identifier (STUDYID in trial summary (TS) and [study-id] in the study tagging file (STF)) should be identical wherever possible. For studies where alignment of the study identifier across TS and STF is not feasible, the value for [study-id] used in the STF should be included in TS using the parameter SPREFID. Though SPREFID is not in the SDTM controlled terminology for TSPARMCD, please use SPREFID to reconcile study identifiers where necessary for SEND or SDTM studies. FDA will use SPREFID to match study identifiers across STF and TS to establish the study start date where necessary for evaluation against the eCTD validation criteria.
Data Submission News – Other FDA Update

➢ Study Data Technical Conformance Guide
Last Update October 2021 – No major changes
https://www.fda.gov/media/153632/download

➢ Data Standards for Drug and Biological Product Submissions Containing Real-World Data (October 2021 draft version, Comments by January 22nd, 2022)

➢ Use of “Simplified ts.xpt files (November 2019)
https://www.fda.gov/media/132457/download
Submission of Raw Data to EMA
What Might the Future Landscape of Submitting Data Look Like in 2025
PHUSE 2021
Presented by Eftychia-Eirini Psarelli on 15 November 2021
Methodology Workstream, Data Analytics and Methods Task Force, EMA

The purpose of the project is to determine the regulatory benefit of access to raw data via pilots of analysis of raw data from clinical trials, before coming back with recommendations to the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP).

Ultimate aim is for the Network to understand and take informed decisions on the place of analysis of raw data for future regulatory submissions.

The way ahead...what the future would look like?

- Data landscape
  - Quality and manufacturing structured data
  - Veterinary data
  - Combine submission data with external data
- Data standards and analytical software
  - Beyond CDISC data format (e.g. HL7 FHIR)
  - Beyond SAS (e.g. R, R-shiny)
  - Visualisation software
- EMA: Working for every patient in Europe → working for every agency in Europe
  - IT solution should be working for all 27 EU Member states providing fair access to raw data

Proof-of-concept raw data pilots

- Design phase ongoing
- Selection of procedures
  - Raw data analysis for approximately 10 Marketing Authorisation Applications
  - Clinical (including modelling & simulation, Good Clinical Practice data) and non-clinical
  - Initial marketing authorisations and variations
  - Different types of applicants (large pharmaceutical companies, small/medium-size enterprises)
  - Parallel submission to FDA or PMDA can be considered
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