

Why is so much clinical research ignored and what do we do about it?

Aileen Grant ^{1*}

Shaun Treweek ²

Mary Wells ¹

Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport, University of Stirling

*Corresponding author

1. Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport, University of Stirling (aileen.grant@stir.ac.uk)

2. Health Services Research Unit, University of Aberdeen

Published in *British Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 2016. Volume 77, Supplement 10, pp. 554-555 by MA Healthcare. The final published version is available at:

<http://www.magonlinelibrary.com/doi/abs/10.12968/hmed.2016.77.10.554>

Key points

- Research evidence from clinical trials is not being translated into clinical practice in a timely manner and this represents an enormous waste of resources and missed opportunities.
- Trials do not publish information about the context in which the intervention was implemented to allow the results to be transferred beyond the trial setting.
- Health care professionals need contextual information to be able to make the judgement 'will it work in my setting?'
- The outcome detected in the trial could be the treatment, elements of the context, the research process or a combination of all three.
- Context is recognised as important but there is poor conceptualisation and no agreed definition.
- Funding into methodological research is urgently required to address this problem and to stop wasting up to 85% of research investment.

Health care professionals' use of the best available evidence is essential to providing high quality care in a high functioning health care system. Globally we spend billions of pounds each year on clinical, health services and public health research. Unfortunately, many patients treated in health care systems across the world fail to benefit from this research because the findings are not relevant to them, or they are not translated into policy and practice in a timely manner. It has been estimated that it takes on average 17 years for knowledge from research to get into practice.(Morris, Wooding et al. 2011) While some research is adopted much more quickly than this (e.g. the football-centred FFIT trial aimed to reduce the weight of overweight, middle-aged men; it did do this and the FFIT program was implemented immediately by football clubs),(Hunt, Wyke et al. 2014) the average length of time taken represents enormous waste as well as missed opportunities to improve healthcare. It has been estimated that 85% of medical research investment is squandered,(Chalmers, Glasziou 2009) making the problem of 'research waste' an international priority.(Chalmers, Bracken et al. 2014) A key focus is to improve the translation of research into clinical practice.

Much of this work is targeted at getting the results of randomised controlled trials into practice. For example, in heart failure we have over 20 years' worth of evidence from trials showing strong effects for treatments which reduce symptoms and chance of death. Despite a plethora of good evidence, data from clinical practice show uptake is low.(McDonagh, Blue et al. 2011) There is often huge inconsistency between research evidence and routine clinical practice.

Why is so much clinical research being ignored?

There are three key reasons for this: (1) there is not enough contextual information provided to transfer the results from the trial setting into other settings; (2) many trials are of low quality; (3) the results of many trials are not published because the results were not as good as expected. Initiatives such as the 'All trials campaign' (<http://www.alltrials.net/>), which aims to see all trials registered and their data published, are part of the solution but are not the complete answer. Evidence is only useful when it makes sense to decision-makers and is meaningful for their particular practice or policy context. Trials focus on optimising efficacy or effectiveness (internal validity) but not on identifying how the intervention works and how dependent this was on the context in which it was implemented (external validity). This information is fundamental to allow judgements as to whether the results can be transferred to another setting outside the specific trial context.(Wells, Williams et al. 2012) In other words, it can be difficult or impossible to answer the question: 'Yes, but will it work in my setting?' A recent systematic summary of surgical trials concluded that lack of detail is the main contributing factor in poor uptake of trial findings.(Blencowe, Boddy et al 2015)

Health-care practitioners and policy makers need to be able to understand the cause of the observed effect detected in the trial. However, the cause could be the treatment alone, elements of the context within which the treatment is being delivered, elements of the research process or a combination of all three. As a result it can be difficult to separate the treatment from the context within which it was evaluated.(Wells, Williams et al. 2012) Even a seemingly simple switch from one pill to another can stumble because of system constraints such as storage requirements of the new drug, its cost and availability, patient preferences, or existing beliefs among staff as to the benefits of the old drug. More complex treatments, such as radiotherapy, are more vulnerable to context effects. For example, the CHART trial showed that CHART was superior to conventional radiotherapy

for non-small cell lung cancer.(Saunders, Dische et al. 1999) However, despite its higher potential of cure, it was not widely adopted in clinical practice, not because it was not cost-effective but because of a 'combination of socio-economical, institutional, practical departmental and physician-bound factors'.(Lievens, Kesteloot et al. 2005) Where multi-component, team-delivered treatments such as surgery and rehabilitation approaches are being tested, the scope for context to matter increases enormously.

What can and should be done about this fundamental problem?

Understanding the contextual factors influencing health care practices within trials requires careful attention. At present, there is agreement within the academic community that we need to better understand the context of trials but there is no accepted and widely used definition and the domains of context that are important to the effectiveness (or not) of interventions is highly contested. There is support in the UK for running process evaluation studies alongside trials, which aim to understand the trial processes and underlying mechanisms in relation to context, setting, professionals and patients.(Grant, Treweek et al. 2013) Indeed, the UK Medical Research Council has recently published guidance on how to conduct these studies, recommending three aspects should be explored: implementation, mechanisms of action and context.(Medical Research Council, 2015) However, the guidance provides little clarification on **how** these aspects should be explored. Given the lack of conceptualisation, understanding and reporting of the effects of context, this is perhaps not surprising. A substantial review of 70 systematic reviews looking at the evidence-to-practice gap in primary care published in 2015 concluded that future research needs to concentrate on how and why contextual factors influence the uptake of particular treatments.(Lau R, Stevenson F et al. 2015) Although this work had a primary care focus, its findings are likely to be more widely relevant.

There are ideas about how context affects the outcome of trials, such as: the health care system and political values; the belief and motivation in the research questions, the intervention and the trial outcome by professionals and patients; having the appropriate processes and systems in place to ensure the intervention is compatible and can be delivered as required (e.g. leadership, computer systems, financial support, adequate staff resources); readiness to change, appropriate skills and training of staff; competing demands (including routine work, other research projects). At present, it is difficult to know how much of an impact context has because there is a lack of a practical conceptual model, lack of clear definitions of contextual factors, and the lack of well specified measures.(Kaplan, Brady et al. 2010)

To inform practice and policy we also need consistent and standardised reporting of context. Through better reporting, interventions and trials can be designed to take account of contextual factors and influences so there is a better fit between intervention and trial design and context. We could quickly build a better picture of how interventions work and how they interact with context. For contextual information to inform the trial findings there is a need for the trial and process evaluation to be more integrated. Process evaluations cannot be published until after the main trial result and process evaluations are often such large projects they are split into a number of publications, which can lead to a significant publication delay between trial and the various process evaluation publications. Publishing the process evaluation papers alongside the trial, as an integral part of the trial reporting, would greatly improve the transferability of the trial findings. Even better

evidence would be a synthesis of the findings of both the trial and the process evaluation, but this will only be achieved with better conceptualisation and reporting of contextual factors.

Researchers and funders are under increasing scrutiny to provide evidence of the impact of their research on clinical care. Research is unlikely to achieve its potential impact unless we have a better understanding of the way in which different contexts and contextual factors influence the delivery and outcomes of interventions. If we are to stop wasting 85% of all spending on health research: we need to incorporate aspects of context into trial and intervention design and improve reporting. There is growing recognition of the importance of understanding context, especially with regard to identifying the important factors to consider when transferring research results into a diverse range of clinical and policy settings. The disconnect between the importance of the problem and the ability to do anything about it will remain, so long as funding for methodology research remains such a small part of the overall health research funding budget.

References

- BLENCOWE, NS, BODDY, AP, HARRIS, A, HANNA, T, WHITING, P, COOK, JA & BLAZEYBY, JM, 2015. Systematic review of intervention design and delivery in pragmatic and explanatory surgical randomized clinical trials. *British Journal of Surgery*, **102**, pp. 1037-47.
- CHALMERS, I., BRACKEN, M.B., DJULBEGOVIC, B., GARATTINI, S., GRANT, J., GÜLMEZOGLU, A.M., HOWELLS, D.W., IOANNIDIS, J.P.A. and OLIVER, S., 2014. How to increase value and reduce waste when research priorities are set. *The Lancet*, **383**(9912), pp. 156-165.
- CHALMERS, I. and GLASZIOU, P., 2009. Avoidable waste in the production and reporting of research evidence. *The Lancet*, **374**(9683), pp. 86-89.
- GRANT, A., TREWEEK, S., DREISCHULTE, T., FOY, R. and GUTHRIE, B., 2013. Process evaluations for cluster-randomised trials of complex interventions: a proposed framework for design and reporting. *Trials*, **14**(1), pp. 15.
- HUNT, K., WYKE, S., GRAY, C.M., ANDERSON, A.S., BRADY, A., BUNN, C., DONNAN, P.T., FENWICK, E., GRIEVE, E., LEISHMAN, J., MILLER, E., MUTRIE, N., RAUCHHAUS, P., WHITE, A. and TREWEEK, S., 2014. A gender-sensitised weight loss and healthy living programme for overweight and obese men delivered by Scottish Premier League football clubs (FFIT): a pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*, **383**(9924), pp. 1211-1221.
- KAPLAN, R.M., BRADY, P.W., DRITZ, M.C., HOOPER, D.K., LINAM, W.M., FROEHLE, C.M. and MARGOLIS, P., 2010. The Influence of Context on Quality Improvement Success in Health Care: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *The Milbank Quarterly*, (- 4), pp. - 500.
- LAU R, STEVENSON F, ONG BN, DZIEDZIC K, TREWEEK S, ELDRIDGE S, EVERITT H, KENNEDY A, QURESHI N, RODGERS A, PEACOCK R, MURRAY E, 2015. Achieving change in primary care—effectiveness of strategies for improving implementation of complex interventions: systematic review of reviews. *BMJ Open*, **5**, pp. e009993.
- LIEVENS, Y., KESTELOOT, K. and BOGAERT, W.V.D., 2005. CHART in lung cancer: Economic evaluation and incentives for implementation. *Radiotherapy and Oncology*, **75**(2), pp. 171-178.
- MCDONAGH T.A, BLUE L., CLARK A.L, DAHLSTROM U, EKMAN I, LAINSCAK M, MCDONALD K, RYDER M, STROMBERG A, JAARSMAN T., 2011. European Society of Cardiology Heart Failure Association Standards for Delivering Heart Failure Care. *European Journal of Heart Failure*, **13**, pp. 235-241.

MEDICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, 2015. Process evaluation of complex interventions: UK Medical Research Council (MRC) guidance.

MORRIS, Z.S., WOODING, S. and GRANT, J., 2011. The answer is 17 years, what is the question: understanding time lags in translational research. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, **104**(12), pp. 510-520.

SAUNDERS, M., DISCHE, S., BARRETT, A., HARVEY, A., GRIFFITHS, G. and PARMAR, M., 1999. Continuous, hyperfractionated, accelerated radiotherapy (CHART) versus conventional radiotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: mature data from the randomised multicentre trial. *Radiotherapy and Oncology*, **52**(2), pp. 137-148.

WELLS, M., WILLIAMS, B., TREWEEK, S., COYLE, J. and TAYLOR, J., 2012. Intervention description is not enough: evidence from an in-depth multiple case study on the untold role and impact of context in randomised controlled trials of seven complex interventions. *Trials*, **13**(1), pp. 95.

Conflict of Interest

All authors declare they have no conflicts of interest