

## PRECLINICAL DATA FORUM / EQIPD Training Workshop “How to Make Preclinical Research Robust”

### Outline

Customized for projects where EQIPD provides support to research teams in a package including:

- A series of training seminars (i.e., the workshop below)
- Review of current practices and improvement recommendations
- Support in developing rigorous study plans

This training is held as a videoconference over four days, other formats possible

EQIPD volume on Good Research Practice in Non-Clinical Pharmacology and Biomedicine (all chapters in open access):

<https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-33656-1>

### AGENDA FOR THE INITIAL TRAINING

DAY 1 – **Why** are we talking about research rigor?

Time	Topic
Pre-read	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Ioannidis 2005</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Nuzzo 2015</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">SYRCLE RoB tool</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Currie et al 2019</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Macleod et al 2020</a></li> </ul>
09.00 – 09.15	Introductions, Agenda, Workshop objectives
09.15 – 10.00	Evidence for lacking rigor in research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meta-research</li> <li>- PPV and the Ioannidis paper</li> <li>- Surveys of current practices</li> <li>- “Reproducibility” discussion</li> </ul>
10.00 – 10.20	Origins of lacking rigor in research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Competition; Pressure to publish; Lack of tolerance to negative data; Risks of bias; Lack of training; Dichotomous decision making</li> </ul>

---

*(one-question poll on which of the above is the most relevant for the students)<sup>1</sup>*

<b>10.20 – 10.40</b>	Impact of lacking rigor in research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethics (incl. RAW), Patients, Reputation of individual scientists, Monetary (society, funders, scientists), IP</li> <li>- Boundary between GRP and RI</li> </ul>
<b>10.40 – 11.05</b>	Open discussion: Who is in the greatest need of higher research quality standards – industry, academia, CROs, young scientists or mature researchers? (i.e., who should not wait until tomorrow)
<b>11.05 – 11.10</b>	Homework: Ask to find whether student’s institution has a RI policy and whether it covers “questionable research practices” such as those in ALLEA (no feedback expected)
<b>11.10 – 11.25</b>	Coffee break & Networking <sup>2</sup>
<b>11.25 – 12.10</b>	Systematic Reviews: a tool to identify factors important for research quality
<b>12.10 - 12.55</b>	Identifying sources of bias, and assessing internal validity and risks of bias in primary studies (using SYRCLE’s risk of bias tool)
<b>12.55 – 13.00</b>	Challenge Question <sup>3</sup>

---

**DAY 2 – What do we need to do to enhance research rigor? (Part 1 – Rigor in study design)**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>
<b>Pre-read</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Dirnagl 2020</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Bert et al 2019</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Lefevre and Balice-Gordon 2020</a></li> </ul>
<b>9.00 – 9.15</b>	Feedback & discussion on the Challenge Question from the last session
<b>9.15 – 10.00</b>	Knowledge-claiming research: What this is? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exploratory vs confirmatory</li> <li>- Hypothesis-generating vs hypothesis testing</li> <li>- Decision support / enablement</li> <li>- Lessons learned from EBM</li> <li>- Attributes of knowledge-claiming research (<i>must</i> and <i>should</i>)</li> <li>- Factors that prevent implementation of maximal possible rigor</li> </ul> <i>(one-question poll on which factors and conditions are the most interfering with application of greater rigor)</i>
<b>10.00 – 10.15</b>	Open discussion: Should these standards apply to in vitro research? To the same extent as to in vivo?
<b>10.15 - 10.45</b>	Pre-specification

---

<sup>1</sup> to be administered in such a way that the speaker does not get distracted and the results are shared with the audience at the end

<sup>2</sup> at least one course instructor stays online to answer questions or facilitate the discussion during the breaks

<sup>3</sup> These are questions that participants are asked to think about and will be discussed during the next session

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Researcher's degrees of freedom</li> <li>- Inclusion &amp; exclusion criteria</li> <li>- Preregistration</li> </ul>
<b>10.45 – 11.00</b>	Open discussion: Use of lab journals – what they are and why are they important?
<b>11.00 – 11.15</b>	Coffee break & Networking
<b>11.15 – 12.00</b>	Blinding & randomization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Practical aspects</li> <li>- Challenges and exceptions</li> </ul>
<b>12.00 – 12.15</b>	Open discussion: When and how can the research rigor measures be harmful?
<b>12.15 – 13.00</b>	Concept of statistical power <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prevalence of underpowered studies</li> <li>- Why power is important</li> <li>- When power becomes critical</li> <li>- Biological vs experimental units, technical vs biological replicates</li> </ul>
<b>12.55 – 13.00</b>	Challenge Question

**DAY 3 – What do we need to do to enhance research rigor? (Part 2 – Data integrity and analysis)**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>
<b>Pre-read</b>	- <a href="#">Motulsky 2014</a>
<b>9.00 – 9.15</b>	Feedback & discussion on the Challenge Question from the last session
<b>9.15 – 9.45</b>	Effect size estimation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Practical aspects (do's and donot's)</li> </ul>
<b>9.45 – 10.00</b>	Open discussion: How do you deal with effect size estimation if no prior studies, if physiological or therapeutic relevance of any specific effect size is not known?
<b>10.00 – 11.00</b>	From pre-specified endpoints to data analysis: Common mistakes and how this affects data robustness
<b>11.00 - 11.15</b>	Coffee break & Networking
<b>11.15 – 11.30</b>	Open discussion: Why do we need to keep raw data?
<b>11.30 – 12.10</b>	Data integrity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Raw data</li> <li>- ALCOA principles</li> <li>- FAIR</li> </ul>
<b>12.10 – 12.25</b>	Hands-on (interactive discussion): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How to set-up unique study IDs?</li> <li>- How to trace back published data to raw data?</li> <li>- How to archive data?</li> </ul>
<b>12.25 – 12.35</b>	Open discussion: Why quality matters for you (referring to the EQIPD slide deck)?
<b>12.35 – 12.40</b>	Challenge Question

**DAY 4 – How do we introduce the changes needed to enhance research rigor?**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>
<b>Pre-read</b>	<a href="#">ARRIVE 2.0 guidelines</a> with explanations ( <a href="#">separate file</a> ) Videos introducing EQIPD Quality System: <a href="#">Why</a> (Part 1), <a href="#">What</a> (Part 2), and <a href="#">How</a> (Part 3)
<b>9.00 – 9.20</b>	Impact of lacking rigor in research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethics (incl. RAW), Patients, Reputation of individual scientists, Monetary (society, funders, scientists), IP</li> <li>- Boundary between GRP and RI</li> </ul>
<b>9.20 – 9.35</b>	Feedback & discussion on the Challenge Question from the last session
<b>9.35 – 10.05</b>	Publication standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ARRIVE guidelines</li> <li>- Minimum information reporting standards</li> </ul> <i>(one-question poll “have you heard about ARRIVE?”)</i>
<b>10.05 – 10.50</b>	Publication standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presenting data in publications (bar graphs, approaches to inference, etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>10.50 – 11.05</b>	Open discussion: What if the editor or reviewers request data to be presented in a “conventional way”?
<b>11.05 – 11.35</b>	Negative results: What are they and what do we do with them? <i>(two-question poll about publishing of negative results)</i>
<b>11.35 – 11.50</b>	Coffee break & Networking
<b>11.50– 12.20</b>	EQIPD Quality System (assuming that everyone watched the videos and basics do not need to be re-introduced) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction using a series of examples</li> <li>- Implementation options</li> </ul>
<b>12.20 – 12.30</b>	Closing remarks / discussion