



Development of SPIRIT-CONSORT surrogate extensions

Rod Taylor. Prof of Population
Health Research MSc, PhD







Disclosures

- No personal conflicts
- Development of SPIRIT/CONSORT extensions funded by UK Medical Research Council (grant number MR/V038400/1

Reporting Guideline Development





Integrated knowledge translation strategy

Publish:

- Project protocol
- Scoping and targeted review protocol
- Scoping review results
- · SPIRIT extension; CONSORT extension
- Explanation and Elaboration document

Key partner engagement:

Endorsement and publication in

- https://www.equator-network.org
- http://www.consort-statement.org
- https://www.spirit-statement.org

Stakeholder engagement:

- · Project website and Twitter account
- Conference & meetings presentations
- Develop lay summaries of the extensions
- Communication with the public (e.g., through social media, press releases)
- Video tutorials

Phase 1: Literature reviews (Months 1-6)

- Generate candidate items for inclusion in extensions
- Identify trials and surrogate content authors

Phase 2: Delphi survey (Months 4-12)

- Rate candidate items
- Propose additional items

Phase 3: Consensus meeting (Months 13-15)

- Agree on final items for inclusion in extensions
- Discuss knowledge translation strategies

Phase 4: Knowledge translation (Months 15-18 and beyond)

Engage stakeholders and disseminate project outputs

Integrated Patient and Public Involvement (PPI)

Phase 1

Consultation with PPI representatives on candidate items

Phase 2

Trained PPI representatives participate in Delphi survey

Phase 3

Subset of PPI representatives from Phase 2 participate in the consensus meeting

Phase 4

Disseminate extensions to patient/community networks and forums

Improved transparency of reporting and design of RCTs that use surrogate endpoints

Phase 1: Literature reviews

▶Scoping review

- ▶ Definitions
- ► Acceptability
- **▶** Limitations
- ► Guidance/advice in design and reporting
- ▶ Data from 90 records synthesised into 17 candidate items



Journal of Clinical Epidemiology

Volume 160, August 2023, Pages 83-99



Review Article

Definitions, acceptability, limitations, and guidance in the use and reporting of surrogate end points in trials: a scoping review

Anthony Muchai Manyara ^a A Manyara ^a A Manyara ^a A Manyara ^a A Manyara ^a Anthony Muchai Mucha

Phase 1: Literature reviews

►Targeted review

- >~3500 trials and protocols published in last 5 years identified
- ► 1400 trial authors invited to participate in the Delphi survey
- Synthesis of the completeness of reporting in protocols and reports using surrogate primary endpoints

Phase 2: e-Delphi survey

- 212 registered and were eligible
 - 195 (92%) rated items in Round 1, 176 (83%) in Round 2
- Representation from 31 countries & >26 clinical/research areas
- Multistakeholder effort:
 - Clinicians, trial investigators, methodologists, statisticians, PPI partners, HTA experts, funding panel members, surrogate content experts, journal editors, regulatory assessor, ethics committee members, funding panel members
- Round 1 open from 24th August to 10th October 2022; and Round 2: 31st October to 11th December 2022.

Consensus definition

- ► As per the project protocol, consensus was defined as follows:
 - Consensus for inclusion: ≥70% participants scoring 7-9 and <15% participants scoring 1-3</p>
 - Consensus for exclusion: ≥70% participants scoring 1-3 and <15% of participants scoring 7-9</p>
 - No consensus for inclusion or exclusion: failure to achieve both the above

Rated items and consensus

- The 17 items identified from scoping review refined to 13 CONSORT items and 9 SPIRIT items
 - Rating for CONSORT and SPIRIT items done in a single Delphi survey
 - One more item for both CONSORT and SPIRIT added in Round 2
- 10 CONSORT and 7 SPIRIT items achieved consensus for inclusion after Delphi Round 2
- 4 CONSORT and 3 SPIRIT items did not reach consensus discussed in Consensus meeting

Consensus meeting

- ► Hybrid meeting on 13th-14th March 2023
- ➤ 33 delegates (10 in Glasgow + 23 virtual), 4 observers
- ▶ Discussion and vote on 3 for SPIRIT and 4 for CONSORT items
- ▶ Consensus: 5 for inclusion and 2 for exclusion
- ▶ Fine tune items that reached consensus for inclusion



Integration of PPI in the project

- Virtual learning workshop on 15th August 2022
- 19 PPI partners attended
- Interactive learning on what are surrogate endpoints and project rationale
- Most of PPI partners attending workshop participated in Delphi survey
- Four joined the Consensus Meeting

Integrated Patient and Public Involvement (PPI)

Phase 1

Consultation with PPI representatives on candidate items

Phase 2

Trained PPI representatives participate in Delphi survey

Phase 3

Subset of PPI representatives from Phase 2 participate in the consensus meeting

Phase 4

Disseminate extensions to patient/community networks and forums

Phase 4: Knowledge translation

Integrated knowledge translation strategy

Publish:

- Project protocol
- Scoping and targeted review protocol
- Scoping review results
- SPIRIT extension; CONSORT extension
- **Explanation and Elaboration** document

Key partner engagement:

Endorsement and publication in

- https://www.equator-network.org
- http://www.consort-statement.org
- https://www.spirit-statement.org

Stakeholder engagement:

- Project website and Twitter account
- Conference & meetings presentations
- Develop lay summaries of the extensions
- Communication with the public (e.g., through social media, press releases)
- Video tutorials



Open access Protocol

BMJ Open Scoping and targeted reviews to support development of SPIRIT and CONSORT extensions for randomised controlled trials with surrogate primary endpoints: protocol

Anthony Muchai Manyara , ¹ Philippa Davies, ² Derek Stewart, ³ Valerie Wells, ¹ Christopher Weir , ⁴ Amber Young , ² Rod Taylor, ^{1,5} Oriana Ciani⁶

Open access Protocol

BMJ Open Protocol for the development of SPIRIT and CONSORT extensions for randomised controlled trials with surrogate primary endpoints: SPIRIT-SURROGATE and CONSORT-SURROGATE

Lancet eClinicalMedicine 2023;65: 102283

Patient and Public Involvement Partner LIK

Articles

A framework for the definition and interpretation of the use of surrogate endpoints in interventional trials



Oriana Ciani, ^{a,ap} Anthony M. Manyara, ^{b,ap} Philippa Davies, ^c Derek Stewart, ^d Christopher J. Weir, ^e Amber E. Young, ^f Jane Blazeby, ^{c,f,g}
Nancy J. Butcher, ^{h,j} Sylwia Bujkiewicz, ^j An-Wen Chan, ^{k,l} Dalia Dawoud, ^m Martin Offringa, ^{h,n} Mario Ouwens, ^a Asbjørn Hróbjartssson, ^{p,q}
Alain Amstutz, ^r Luca Bertolaccini, ^s Vito Domenico Bruno, ^t Declan Devane, ^{u,v} Christina D. C. M. Faria, ^w Peter B. Gilbert, ^x Ray Harris, ^d Marissa Lassere, ^y
Lucio Marinelli, ^{z,aa} Sarah Markham, ^{ab} John H. Powers, ^{ac} Yousef Rezaei, ^{adae,af} Laura Richert, ^{ag} Falk Schwendicke, ^{ah} Larisa G. Tereshchenko, ^{al}
Achilles Thoma, ^{aj} Alparslan Turan, ^{ak} Andrew Worrall, ^d Robin Christensen, ^{al} Gary S. Collins, ^{am} Joseph S. Ross, ^{an,ao} and Rod S. Taylor^{b, *,ap}



^aCentre for Research on Health and Social Care Management, SDA Bocconi School of Management, Milan, Italy ^bMRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, School of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK ^cPopulation Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK