IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Decentralized Clinical Trials: Platform & Software Guide

> Build practical AI for pharma and biotech with IntuitionLabs. We help life-science teams turn complex information and workflows into useful software, governed knowledge systems and AI tools.

Published by IntuitionLabs · 2026-03-05 · decentralized clinical trials · dct software · clinical trial platforms · hybrid trials · remote data collection · digital health technologies · econsent

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/decentralized-clinical-trials-platforms-software-guide



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Technology Enablers and Software Solutions
4. Platform Comparison and Categories
5. Implementation Guide: Steps and Considerations
6. Data and Evidence
7. Case Studies and Real-World Examples
8. Discussion and Future Directions
9. Conclusion

Executive Summary

Decentralized clinical trials (DCTs) – also called virtual or hybrid trials – represent a paradigm shift in clinical research whereby trial activities are conducted outside the traditional brick-and-mortar site model. In DCTs, participants often enroll, consent, and provide data from home or local health facilities using digital tools such as telehealth visits, mobile apps, wearable sensors, and remote monitoring devices (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) (jamanetwork.com). This approach exploded in importance during the COVID-19 pandemic, as social distancing forced sponsors to adopt remote methods and regulators issued new guidelines. DCT design should reflect patient needs and the requirements of each trial, rather than assuming one model fits all (Betcheva et al.).

This report provides a comprehensive, evidence-based overview of DCTs in 2026. We begin with background on the history and motivation for DCTs, including definitions and regulatory context. We examine the core enabling technologies (eConsent, eCOA/ePRO, eSource, telemedicine, wearables, logistics platforms, etc.) and then compare the major software platforms/vendors serving DCTs. An implementation guide outlines practical steps and challenges (protocol design, patient training, data management, monitoring, etc.) for shifting to DCT models. We present data from recent studies – including patient participation rates, recruitment speed, demographic diversity, retention, and environmental impact – to highlight DCT outcomes. A series of case studies (e.g. large virtual trials, a published Singapore trial with 97% retention, and analyses by FDA and Tufts–CSDD) illustrate the real-world impact of DCTs. Finally, we discuss implications and future directions: as regulators worldwide release final guidance (FDA 2024, EMA/ACT-EU), DCTs are becoming standardized. Key challenges remain (digital divide, data privacy, consensus terminology, etc.), but expert consensus is that DCTs can greatly expand access and efficiency of trials. Given the depth of recent research and regulatory support, we conclude DCTs will be an integral part of clinical research going forward.

Introduction and Background

What are decentralized clinical trials? There is growing consensus (and regulatory guidance) that a *decentralized clinical trial (DCT)* is one in which **“some or all trial-related activities occur at locations other than traditional clinical trial sites”** such as participants’ homes or local clinics (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).

These activities may include eConsent, outcome assessments (eCOA), laboratory/sample collection via home health nurses, drug delivery, tele-visits, mobile apps for patient-reported data, wearable sensors, and remote monitoring. In a *fully* DCT, *all* activities are off-site; in *hybrid* or blended models, some recruitment or interventions still occur at a clinic. Critically, DCTs use digital health technologies (DHTs) – telemedicine, cloud data capture, smartphone apps, etc. – to enable remote participation (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). FDA's guidance provides recommendations for sponsors, investigators, and other interested parties regarding the implementation of decentralized elements in clinical trials (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) (www.fda.gov). (The Australian term "teletrials" (TT) likewise refers to networked approaches where care is shared between sites, but key is the same goal of reducing patient travel (jamanetwork.com).)

Historical context. The notion of "virtual" or "digital" trials predates COVID-19, with pilot programs using telehealth, home visits, or mobile apps even in the 2010s. However, adoption was slow until the pandemic. Leading experts note that **COVID-19 was a turning point**: measures to maintain trial continuity (site closures and travel bans) *"precipitated the rapid uptake of digital health for the conduct of clinical trials"* (jamanetwork.com). By early 2020 many sponsors suddenly implemented remote consent, remote monitoring, and home delivery of study supplies. Indeed, one analyst observes that 2020–2021 saw remote eConsent, home visits and digital monitoring "move from optional to operational in many trial protocols" (www.biopharmatrend.com). The survey compared current adoption of remote monitoring and data-collection technologies with adoption aspired to five years ahead (JAMA Network Open). In short, what was once a niche has become mainstream: DCTs are now *expected* components of patient-centric research (jamanetwork.com) (link.springer.com).

Drivers for DCT adoption. Several factors drove the rise of DCTs. A key motivation is **patient-centricity**: reducing subject burden (travel time, costs, time off work) improves access and retention. Underhill et al. note that DCTs can better reach "geographically dispersed" or underserved patients and thus address equity gaps (jamanetwork.com). Likewise, market analysis cites *"rising demand for patient-centric research models"* as a primary DCT driver (www.24lifesciences.com). Technological advances also enabled DCTs: widespread broadband/internet, smartphone penetration, cloud EDC systems, wearable sensor tech, and robust telehealth platforms. Economically, sponsors face high trial costs; hybrid and decentralized models offer **cost and time efficiencies**. For example, Cussen and Littler's scoping review identifies reduced costs and participant burden as commonly cited advantages of DCTs (Cussen and Littler). (A Boston Medidata interview similarly highlights faster startup and lower clinic overhead.)

Regulatory and market context (2023–2026). Regulators have moved from caution to active guidance on DCTs. In late 2024 the FDA issued final guidance *"Conducting Clinical Trials with Decentralized Elements"* (www.fda.gov); this guidance is not binding on FDA or the public. The European Medicines Agency (EMA), via its ACT-EU initiative, likewise published recommendations to *"facilitate decentralized clinical trials"*, including home health visits, remote monitoring, shipping of investigational drugs directly to patients, and eConsent (www.ema.europa.eu). FDA guidance offers recommendations rather than a mandate to adopt decentralized elements (FDA); the European recommendations include national provisions for specific decentralized trial elements (EMA).

For the broader decentralized and digitalized clinical trials market, 360iResearch forecasts a CAGR of **7.44%** through **2032** (360iResearch). Sponsors, CROs and tech companies are all investing heavily: Digital Health Global reported new Tufts CSDD data in January 2025 showing nearly *fourfold* higher enrollment of American Indian/Alaska Native subjects in DCTs, and a significant jump (to 55.7%) in female participation (www.digitalhealthglobal.com). In summary, by 2026 DCTs have moved well beyond pilot experiments into the core strategy of clinical development.

Technology Enablers and Software Solutions

Decentralized trials rely on a broad suite of digital tools. Key categories include:

- **Electronic Consent (eConsent)**: Digital platforms (e.g. REDCap e-consent, Docusign, proprietary apps) to obtain and document informed consent remotely. Typically integrated into trial systems so patients can watch information videos, complete quizzes, and sign digitally (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).
- **Electronic Clinical Outcome Assessment (eCOA/ePRO)**: Online or mobile surveys for patient-reported outcomes. These systems (e.g. YPrime, CRF Health, Medable's eCOA module) let patients enter diary data from home. They improve data capture speed and reduce data entry error.
- **Telemedicine/Telehealth**: Video-conferencing apps (Zoom, VSee, proprietary CTMS-integrated modules) enable virtual investigator visits. Home health nurses may conduct physical exams or blood draws under direction. Diverse telemedicine vendors now integrate with trial platforms.
- **Wearables and Remote Monitoring**: Digital health technologies should be verified and validated for the trial's intended use, regardless of whether they meet the statutory definition of a device (FDA guidance). Data from these devices is transmitted to the trial database via smartphone apps or gateways, enabling near-real-time monitoring.
- **Data Capture and Integration**: Unified EDC/EHR platforms are central. Castor EDC, Medidata Rave, Oracle Clinical, and open-source OpenClinica can all be extended with DCT modules. Some trials use APIs to pull data directly from electronic health records (EHRs) into case report forms. For example, the COVID-19 CSSC-004 trial routed patient data from hospital EHRs into the trial database, reducing manual entry (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).
- **Patient Engagement Platforms**: Custom mobile apps like Medable's Unified Platform or Eureka (by UCSF) bundle eConsent, eCOA, reminders, and education. These apps support scheduling, notifications for study tasks, truly 24/7 access, and can tailor messages to improve adherence. (One experience with the "MyCap" app for concussion research showed automated reminders greatly aided retention (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).)
- **Logistics and Direct-to-Patient (DtP) Shipping**: Trial personnel should receive training on handling, packaging, shipping, tracking, and documenting investigational products when applicable (FDA guidance).
- **eTMF and Regulatory Platforms**: Digital Trial Master Files record essential docs electronically. Tools also exist for remote IRB submissions/reliance, and ICH/GCP compliance in a digital environment. For example, eConsent via DocuSign integrated in CTMS can serve as full informed consent documentation

(pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).

Research on digital platforms underscores how **modular** these solutions are. Copland *et al.* (2024) note that DCTs "have used digital platforms" from major vendors such as Medable, Science 37, Castor, THREAD, ObvioHealth, Cognizant, AiCure, and others (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Indeed, a systematic review found that **69%** of recent DCTs explicitly leveraged a "digital platform" for trial management (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). These platforms typically bundle many of the above functions (patient registry, eConsent, EDC, telehealth, analytics) into one interface. For example, design changes proposed for REACT-AF were expected to reduce trial costs by 50%, mainly through decentralized methods; this was a projection for that trial, not an observed saving from software (Hanley et al.).

Table 1 summarizes some prominent DCT technology vendors and their core offerings. (This list is illustrative, not exhaustive.) Copland et al. identified many of these companies as leaders in the field (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).

Vendor/Platform	Type	Key Capabilities	Comment
Medable (USA)	Clinical trial platform	eCOA and eConsent	These are tools within Medable's platform (vendor FAQ).
Science 37 (USA)	Virtual Trial Organizer	eConsent, eCOA, TeleVisit, home nursing integration, trial ops	Pioneer "site network" DCT model; provides (and can staff) local clinical resources for patients at home.
Curebase (USA)	Decentralized CT Platform	Remote patient data capture (ePRO), home visits scheduling, EHR API	Focuses on fully "site-less" trials with local lab connectors. Known for pragmatism in rare-disease and patient-centric trials.
Castor EDC (Netherlands)	Cloud EDC + Modules	EDC, eConsent, ePRO, wearables integration, APIs	University spin-out; widely used by academia and pharma alike. Open for any study phase.
THREAD (USA)	Clinical research platform	Mobile eConsent	Supports eConsent on iOS or Android, with BYOD or provisioned devices (eConsent documentation; platform documentation).
AiCure (USA)	Adherence Monitoring	Smartphone video ingestion, adherence reporting	Ensures meds were taken (video+AI verification). Bridges data to EDC.
ObvioHealth (USA)	Patient Engagement Platform	Mobile app, eConsent, wearables integration, patient reminders	Strong patient-facing focus; supports BYOD studies.
Perceptive eClinical (ClinPhone Pro)	IRT/RTSM software	Randomization and trial supply management	ClinPhone Pro was introduced by Perceptive eClinical in May 2025 (vendor announcement).

Table 1. Examples of DCT technology platforms and vendors. (Sources: Copland et al. 2024 (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov); company literature.)

Platform Comparison and Categories

Given the diversity of tools, we can categorize DCT software into "unified platforms" vs "point solutions":

- **Unified DCT Platforms** (as in Table 1) aim to provide **end-to-end trial management**. They integrate eConsent, patient registry, EDC, eCOA, telehealth, and analytics in one ecosystem. Their strength is seamless data flow and a single user interface for sites/sponsors/patients. For example, Medable documents a connector to external Medidata Rave EDC (Medable connectors). Science 37 described its Metasite offering as a virtual site supplementing a network of traditional sites in its January 2022 prospectus. The downside is these platforms may be heavy-weight, requiring significant sponsor investment and training.
- **Point Solutions** target specific needs. These include stand-alone eConsent platforms (e.g. Signant SmartSignals eConsent), wearable device managers, patient recruitment marketplaces, or eTMF/EHR connectors. Sponsors often mix-and-match: for instance, using one vendor for eCOA (YPrime or CRF Health), another for TeleVisit (Zoom for Healthcare), and a third for EDC (Oracle Clinical One Data Collection). While flexible, this requires custom integration and can increase complexity.

Table 2 contrasts a traditional site-centric trial with a decentralized model. Key differences highlighted in the literature include access, cost, data collection, and patient burden (jamanetwork.com) (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).

Attribute	Traditional Trial	Decentralized/Hybrid Trial
Setting	All key visits & procedures at fixed research sites.	Many activities at home/local clinics; many tele-visits.
Patient Access	Geographic limitations; patients must travel to site.	Broader reach; rural and home-bound patients can participate (jamanetwork.com).
Recruitment	Often slower; limited pool near sites.	Often faster via national ads/social media; e.g. virtual recruitment in AF trial (link.springer.com).
Retention	Dropouts from travel burden/clinic fatigue.	Engagement challenges remain: Trials@Home interviews identified difficulties keeping participants engaged in trial activities (IHI project summary).
Data capture	On-site CRFs, paper forms; episodic monitoring.	Continuous remote data (wearables via API); ePRO real-time; centralized monitoring via dashboards.
Monitoring	Primarily on-site source-data verification (SDV).	Remote/risk-based monitoring dominates; e.g. ACRO notes RBM adoption rose with DCTs (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).
Cost	High (clinic overhead, travel reimbursements).	Trial-specific projection: REACT-AF design changes were expected to reduce costs by 50%; the cited report does not establish a measured saving (Hanley et al.).

Attribute	Traditional Trial	Decentralized/Hybrid Trial
Patient Experience	High burden (travel, time off work).	More convenient and flexible, often improving satisfaction (link.springer.com) (patients prefer phone apps (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)).
Regulatory	Established processes; e.g. in-person consent norms.	Evolving processes (need IRB for eConsent, data privacy compliance, etc.); regulators issuing guidance (FDA 2024).
Diversity	Often limited socio-economic/racial diversity due to access.	In the PACT observational analysis, DCT components were associated with nearly fourfold American Indian/Alaska Native proportional representation (1.9% versus 0.5%). Findings varied across demographic groups and decentralized elements; this does not establish a general diversity benefit (Medable PACT announcement).
Environmental	High (patient/site travel emissions).	Lower footprint (less travel): life-cycle analysis found DCT had better environmental profile (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).

Table 2. Comparison of traditional site-based trials vs decentralized/hybrid trials (summarized from recent literature (jamanetwork.com) (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) and case examples).

Implementation Guide: Steps and Considerations

Transitioning a trial to a decentralized (or hybrid) model involves rethinking nearly every operational step. Below we outline key phases, along with challenges and best practices drawn from industry and academic sources.

1. **Protocol Feasibility & Design**: Early on, determine which elements can be decentralized. Many sponsors start with a hybrid design (e.g. remote follow-up visits after initial in-person screening). Identify endpoints that can be measured remotely (e.g. patient-reported outcomes, vital signs via devices) and plan for those requiring in-person visits (e.g. imaging). Collaborate with stakeholders (investigators, ethics boards) early to ensure all endpoints remain valid. Use the systems-thinking framework described by Betcheva *et al.* to assess the effects of DCT deployment (Betcheva et al.). For example, a pharmaceutical company adapted a Phase II cardiovascular trial: recruitment was done via social media ads, eConsent and eDiary via smartphone app, and home delivery of test drugs; investigators did initial screening via telehealth with local lab tests ordered remotely (link.springer.com).
2. **Regulatory Strategy**: Draft DCT-inclusive documents (protocol, informed consent form) that detail remote procedures. Obtain IRB/ethics approval early for eConsent workflows and remote data handling. Many IRBs now have templates for electronic consent or allow central IRB reliance. Prepare for international regulatory differences in telehealth or shipping investigational products. Utilize FDA's and EMA's published recommendations: e.g., FDA's 2024 guidance clarifies allowance of eConsent and tele-

visits (www.fda.gov), while EMA's ACT-EU Q&A suggests how to implement home health visits. Document privacy protections (HIPAA/GDPR-compliant systems). In practice, cross-functional DCT project teams are essential, including legal/regulatory experts.

3. **Technology Selection**: Choose the digital tools and vendors that fit your protocol. Platforms must be GCP-compliant and validated. Key capabilities to look for include: intuitive eConsent module, patient app (with multi-language support), secure telehealth service, electronic data capture (EDC) with eSource or API connectivity, and reporting dashboards. Trials often blend commercial offerings: e.g., EDC by Castor or Oracle, telehealth (e.g. Zoom for Healthcare), wearable integration via vendor partnerships (like Fitbit's research APIs). Senior management should engage IT and cybersecurity teams early to vet cloud solutions. Ensure drug-supply logistics are in place (e.g. a certified home nursing service for blood draws, or couriers that can handle cold shipments and chain-of-custody).
4. **Site and Staff Training**: Although many activities shift to patients' homes, study staff and sites still play roles (e.g. coordinating local labs, supporting patients with technology). Conduct thorough training on the new tools and workflows. Create clear SOPs: how to enroll a patient remotely, how to initiate a tele-visit, backup plans if internet fails, etc. Have dedicated technical support. The Trial Innovation Network has emphasized "lessons learned" that highlight the importance of designing interfaces with all patients in mind (e.g. screen-reader compatibility, closed captioning) (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Provide patients with simple guides or hotlines to help them use apps or devices.
5. **Patient Recruitment and Engagement**: Leverage online recruitment channels (patient registries, social media, community outreach) as done in the AF trial by *Sarraju et al.* (link.springer.com). Screen potential subjects via tele-interviews and eConsent platforms. Engage patients continuously: use the patient app to send reminders for diary entries or upcoming tele-visits. The Trial Innovation experience suggests automated reminders can markedly improve compliance (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Also incorporate patient feedback: one Singapore DCT found participants preferred using their own smartphones and wanted flexibility in reminder frequency (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).
6. **Data Management and Monitoring**: Implement a **risk-based monitoring (RBM)** plan. Since on-site monitoring is minimized, employ centralized, statistical monitoring of data trends as recommended by ACRO (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). In fact, industry surveys show RBM adoption surged in 2020 as DCTs grew (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Use data analytics dashboards that flag missing data, protocol deviations or safety signals in real time. Ensure integration: if using multiple point solutions, match subject IDs and timestamps across systems. EHR-to-EDC data transfers (as in CSSC-004) can reduce transcription error. Document all remote consent, visits, and device calibrations carefully to meet audit requirements.
7. **Safety and Ethics Oversight**: Establish remote safety monitoring. For drug trials, incorporate telemedicine check-ins by clinicians or local nurses, and have procedures for emergent care if needed. Maintain close communication with DSMB or safety board, providing complete remote data. Ethically, ensure participants have adequate support at home: perhaps nurse hotlines or emergency contacts. Report any issues with the digital tools themselves (e.g. app malfunctions) as part of the safety oversight process.

8. **Logistics and Supply Chain**: Coordinate home delivery of study drugs, devices, or kits. Maintain tight control of investigational products (e.g., via temperature-tracked shipments). Trial-supply software such as ClinPhone Pro supports patient randomization and supply-chain management. Plan for the environmental impact: encourage consolidated shipping or local lab draws to minimize carbon emissions – one analysis suggests DCTs often have a *better environmental profile* than traditional trials (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).
9. **Regulatory Reporting and Documentation**: Ensure remote activities are reflected in regulatory submissions. For example, remote eligibility screening must still be protocol-driven and documented. FDA's 2024 guidance allows remote eConsent and says all digital data must meet quality standards. Track and report enrollment milestones (e.g. TeleVisits completed) just as you would site visit completions. Prepare for remote audits: have digital records (eCRFs, eConsent logs, home health reports) well-organized.

Throughout, apply **change management**: DCTs necessitate a cultural shift. TransCelerate and others suggest creating working groups including patient advocates to refine processes. Report progress and challenges transparently. As Cussen *et al.* emphasize, standardized reporting of methods, including any deviations, is crucial (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Finally, remain agile: sponsor systems should be prepared to adapt (for example, changing a fully remote model mid-study if needed, as occurred in some COVID-era trials).

Data and Evidence

The academic and industry literature now provide concrete data on DCT performance. Key findings include:

- **Recruitment and Speed**: Case reports show dramatically accelerated enrollment. As summarized by Betcheva *et al.*, a 1,000-patient *fully virtual* trial completed enrollment in just 7 months and at a fraction of the typical cost, compared to much longer timelines for similar traditional trials (link.springer.com). Similarly, the virtual atrial fibrillation trial by *Sarraju et al.* used social media and a patient app to achieve high enrollment rates and patient adherence (link.springer.com). These examples suggest DCTs can reduce recruitment cycle times and overall costs, especially for well-designed drug/device studies.
- **Participant Retention**: Retention rates appear higher in DCTs. The aforementioned Singapore PROMOTE study (double-blind RCT) reported **97% retention** (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), far exceeding typical trial attrition. The authors attribute this to the flexibility and low burden of participation. In oncology, Underhill et al. note DCTs can concretely improve equity of access and likely improve outcomes due to higher follow-up compliance (jamanetwork.com). By contrast, the scoping review by Cussen et al. did find that a few trials struggled with retention or skewed recruitment (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), indicating careful design is still needed.
- **Diversity and Inclusion**: The PACT announcement emphasizes that improving diversity requires a multifaceted approach rather than assuming a uniform benefit from decentralization (Medable press release).

- **Operational Metrics**: Besides anecdotal case studies, larger analyses are emerging. A 2026 BMJ Open analysis of 444 metabolic-disease trials (ClinicalTrials.gov) found **27.9%** were at least partly decentralized (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Adoption was significantly higher in Phase 2 (29.7%) and Phase 3 (41.6%) than in Phase 1 (11.4%) (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Notably, Phase 2/3 DCT trials tended to have slightly shorter mean durations (17.3 vs 18.3 months in Phase 2; 23.4 vs 25.0 months in Phase 3) compared to non-DCT controls, though differences were not statistically significant (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The authors interpret these modest time gains (and the failure to reach significance) as indicating the industry is still in a *"learning phase"* (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov): early logistical complexity can offset time savings. They emphasize the need for tailored DCT models and robust training, and anticipate that as expertise grows, efficiency gains should become measurable (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).
- **Quality of Data**: Digital capture generally yields "cleaner" and more complete data (automated prompts reduce missingness). However, transferring responsibility to patients (entering their own vital signs, uploading devices) can raise data integrity issues. Hanley et al. (Trial Innovation Network) note that moving data entry to participants means ensuring quality checks, e.g. clear instructions for device use (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Most DCT proponents therefore advocate for training and support. Real-world evidence suggests eConsent and ePRO are well-accepted, but certain processes (initial screening by telehealth, home sample collection) still need refinement (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Importantly, all decentralized data must still meet regulatory standards: centralized data monitoring plans and audit trails for eSource data are critical.
- **Patient and Stakeholder Perspectives**: Surveys of trialists and patients consistently show support. In JAMA Oncology, Underhill *et al.* reported that clinicians viewed DCTs as *transformative* for cancer care, enabling *"better access to all but particularly geographically dispersed and less privileged patients"* (jamanetwork.com). One site noted that DCTs were "low risk" and could yield large benefits. Interviews in the Singapore trial reported high satisfaction: participants liked using their own devices and completing tasks at home, and overwhelmingly preferred it to traveling to clinics (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Sponsors also cite productivity improvements (fewer lost visits, less drop-out) and faster data lock. On the other hand, some quality boards have noted concerns if digital literacy issues cause accidental exclusion of certain groups (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).
- **Environmental Impact**: A novel benefit of DCTs is reduced carbon emissions. The PROMOTE study conducted a life-cycle assessment and found that, since patient/staff travel was cut, the decentralized model had a *"better environmental profile"* than an equivalent traditional trial (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). This aligns with intuition: eliminating thousands of clinic visits per trial substantially lowers fuel use. As sustainability becomes a corporate concern, this positive (though ancillary) effect of DCTs may gain more attention.

Overall, the evidence indicates that **well-designed DCTs achieve high retention, broader recruitment, and can expedite timelines and inclusivity**. Sponsors and CROs report multiple successful deployments (link.springer.com), but both the literature and regulatory bodies caution that DCT implementation must be done judiciously (citing trial-specific feasibility and ethics) (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).

Case Studies and Real-World Examples

To illustrate these points, we highlight several documented cases:

- **Large-Scale Virtual Trials (USA, 2022-2024)**: Researchers have conducted fully virtual trials involving hundreds or thousands of patients, harnessing national networks. For example, Betcheva *et al.* summarize two virtual-trial examples: one managed 1000 patients remotely in <7 months (link.springer.com), and another enrolled AF patients nationally via social media recruiting and an app-based monitoring system (link.springer.com). Both achieved exceptional accrual speed at much lower costs. In each case, participants reported high satisfaction and willingness to continue, reflecting the smooth remote experience.
- **Singapore PROMOTE Study (2024)**: A Nestlé-sponsored double-blind RCT in Singapore evaluated a consumer health product entirely remotely. The study **achieved 97% retention** and high completion rates for clinical data, including biological samples (primary report). Qualitative interviews revealed participants valued the flexibility and ease of participating from home. Importantly, the trial's ecological assessment showed a lower carbon footprint for the DCT design than a hypothetical traditional trial (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The authors concluded that the DCT model was better for both participants and the planet.
- **Diversity and Implementation**: The PACT analysis calls for a multifaceted approach to diversity rather than assuming a uniform effect from decentralization (Medable press release, January 2025).
- **Trials@Home RADIAL (Europe)**: RADIAL was designed for people with type 2 diabetes treated with basal insulin (Trials@Home). The Trials@Home project received funding from the Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 Joint Undertaking under grant agreement 831458 (2025 process publication).

Collectively, these examples demonstrate that **DCTs can match or exceed traditional trials in key metrics** when properly executed. The consistent themes are rapid enrollment, high adherence, broad reach, and positive patient feedback. Even skeptics acknowledge that remote eConsent and digital outcome reporting work well once validated; the main developmental needs are around initial screening, staffing (e.g. home nurse training), and ensuring equitable technology access (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).

Discussion and Future Directions

Multiple perspectives. Stakeholders have varied views on DCTs. Patients and advocacy groups generally support reduced-burden models, citing time and cost savings. Investigators often welcome efficient patient engagement but stress the need for adequate local medical oversight. Sponsors and CROs value the scalability and data velocity, though the upfront investment (tech platforms, staff re-training) can be substantial. Regulators emphasize participant safety and data integrity; they now tend to view DCTs favorably as long as compliance is documented (e.g. FDA's 2024 guidance explicitly encourages trials to use validated DHTs and to protect patient rights (www.fda.gov)).

Current challenges. Despite successes, DCTs are not without hurdles. The BMJ Open scoping review by Cussen et al. (2025) and others identified inconsistent terminology (many trials calling themselves “remote” or “hybrid”) and incomplete reporting of methods (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). This makes it hard to compare studies systematically. Patient heterogeneity is another issue: digital literacy gaps and uneven internet access can bias enrollment. One implementation review noted that remote recruitment via social media may still miss underserved populations unless specifically targeted (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). There are also operational concerns: reliance on patients to collect data (e.g. using glucometers or scales at home) can introduce errors, so calibration and training are essential. Finally, multi-site coordination gets complex when local regulations differ; aligned guidance like the ACT-EU recommendations helps, but global trials still require careful country-by-country planning.

Emerging trends. Looking ahead, several developments will shape DCTs:

- **Artificial Intelligence and Analytics:** AI is being used for patient matching (identifying eligible patients from EHRs), hotspot identification (finding trial sites with high patient density), and even automated consent chatting (e.g. virtual assistant tutors for informed consent). We may see AI *agents* that help plan patient schedules or predict dropout risks. Some commentators already highlight AI’s role in enabling DCTs (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) (e.g. Clinicals AI blog).
- **Integration with Real-World Data (RWD):** DCTs naturally sit at the interface of clinical trials and RWE. As the cited analysis notes, DCTs aim to enhance “applicability” of results to real-world settings (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Regulators may increasingly allow hybrid designs where routine wearables or EHR data replace some visits. We should watch for frameworks that mix “virtual trial arms” with use of longitudinal patient data from registries or claims.
- **Wearable and Digital Biomarkers:** The proliferation of sensors means trials can capture continuous vitals or novel endpoints (e.g. gait analysis via phone). Future DCTs might rely heavily on such objective measures. Validating these digital biomarkers is ongoing research. Decentralized device trials (e.g. home-based sleep studies, remote spirometry) are burgeoning.
- **Standardization and Guidelines:** Efforts are underway to codify best practices. Industry consortia like TransCelerate are finalizing toolkits and templates for DCTs. Ethical guidelines are also evolving (e.g. new FDA Q&As on IRB review for remote trials, NIH checklists for DCT protocols). We expect harmonized standards in the coming years: Cussen et al. explicitly call for unified terminology and reporting guidelines (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov), and future CONSORT-style extensions for DCTs are likely.
- **Broader Applications:** Originally strong in neurology, cardio, and metabolic studies, DCTs are extending to areas like dermatology, psychiatry, and even oncology. Telehealth is now routine in supportive cancer trials. One can envision immunotherapy trials where most monitoring is remote, or in global health (e.g. smartphone-linked rapid tests in field trials).

Implications: The rise of DCTs has several implications. It democratizes trial participation, potentially speeding drug development. Payers and healthcare systems may also take note, as more evidence can be gathered at lower cost and in broader populations. However, it puts a premium on data stewardship and

technological equity. Sponsors will need robust frameworks for digital inclusivity (providing devices to low-income patients, for example). Training of site staff remains critical – the human element cannot be entirely removed. Finally, data quality standards will need to evolve with these new models.

Conclusion

Decentralized clinical trials have moved from an aspirational concept to a practical reality, accelerated by recent events and enabled by technology. By 2026, nearly every stakeholder in drug development – sponsors, CROs, regulators, and patients – recognizes the value of DCT components. Evidence to date supports the promise: improved retention, faster recruitment, cost savings, and greater diversity, all backed by a growing number of publications (link.springer.com) (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). However, the field is still maturing. Standardized terminology and reporting (as urged by Cussen et al. (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)) will be needed to fully compare approaches. Careful planning and oversight remain essential.

Looking forward, DCTs are poised to become the new normal in clinical research. As systems are refined, we expect to see *intelligent* trial models that blend digital with site-based elements fluidly. Regulator support (FDA's guidance in Sep 2024, EMA's ACT-EU recommendations) provides a clear runway for continued growth. In the long term, the cumulative effect should be a more patient-friendly, efficient, and inclusive R&D process. Researchers and companies that can navigate the technical and logistical complexities of DCTs – while upholding data quality and ethical standards – will reap significant benefits. In sum, decentralized trials have the potential to transform evidence generation, and the data already indicate that many of the anticipated advantages are being realized today (link.springer.com) (www.digitalhealthglobal.com).

Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.

1. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK609002
2. https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamaoncology/fullarticle/2814999
3. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s43441-023-00540-2
4. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11408899
5. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/conducting-clinical-trials-decentralized-elements
6. https://www.biopharmatrend.com/post/636-8-notable-companies-making-strides-in-decentralized-clinical-trials
7. https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2817479
8. https://www.24lifesciences.com/decentralized-clinical-trials-dcts-market-3652
9. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12658491
10. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/facilitating-decentralised-clinical-trials-eu
11. https://www.fda.gov/media/167696/download
12. https://www.360iresearch.com/library/intelligence/decentralized-digitalized-clinical-trials
13. https://www.digitalhealthglobal.com/new-data-reveals-decentralized-clinical-trials-linked-to-improved-diverse-participation-across-many-underrepresented-demographics
14. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10465321

15. https://www.fda.gov/media/155022/download
16. https://www.medable.com/resources/faq
17. https://www.threadresearch.com/one-decentralized-platform/econsent
18. https://www.threadresearch.com/solutions/collect-data
19. https://www.perceptive.com/news/perceptive-eclinical-launches-clinphone-pro-an-innovative-rtsm-platform-built-by-rtsm-experts-for-rtsm-experts
20. https://www.medable.com/platform/medable-connectors
21. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1819113/000110465922017309/tm2131243-9_424b3.htm
22. https://signanthealth.com/solutions/patient-engagement/econsent
23. https://www.oracle.com/corporate/pressrelease/clinical-one-data-collection-cloud-service-061820.html
24. https://www.ihi.europa.eu/projects-results/project-factsheets/trialshome
25. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8889871
26. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11769950
27. https://www.medable.com/newsroom/new-data-reveals-decentralized-clinical-trials-linked-to-improved-diverse-participation-across-many-underrepresented-demographics
28. https://www.biospace.com/press-releases/new-data-reveals-decentralized-clinical-trials-linked-to-improved-diverse-participation-across-many-underrepresented-demographics
29. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC13052762
30. https://trialsathome.com/about-radial
31. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12598124

THE PUBLISHER

About IntuitionLabs

IntuitionLabs is an AI consulting, custom software development and data engineering firm serving pharmaceutical, biotechnology, medical-device and other life-science organizations. We work with clinical, regulatory, medical-affairs, commercial, quality and IT teams to connect technology decisions with the work people need to accomplish.

AI consulting and adoption

Our AI enablement services cover readiness assessments, use-case selection, governance and policies, team workshops, adoption measurement and ongoing advisory support. We help organizations structure the information layer behind AI: source material, context, permissions and maintained knowledge that make generated answers useful and reviewable. Private LLM inference and hosted AI options support teams evaluating how to operate AI with appropriate control over their data and infrastructure.

Software, data and life-science workflows

IntuitionLabs develops custom software for pharma and biotech, integrates enterprise systems, and builds data engineering and business intelligence solutions. Areas of focus include AI agents, regulatory research, medical writing, medical affairs, CMC information, competitive intelligence and clinical-document workflows. Our eTMF intelligence work includes cross-system reconciliation and inspection-readiness support.

Enterprise platforms and regulated delivery

We provide Veeva services, application support, managed services, integrations and custom applications, alongside enterprise content work involving platforms such as Egnyte. For regulated workflows, our services include GxP enablement, computer-system validation and software development addressing 21 CFR Part 11 requirements. The applicable controls, validation responsibilities and acceptance criteria are defined for each engagement.

Work with IntuitionLabs

Explore AI enablement, pharma and biotech software development, data engineering and BI, and Veeva services. Contact IntuitionLabs to discuss your workflow, information sources and implementation needs.

IntuitionLabs publishes educational research to help life-science teams make informed technology decisions. Coverage of a product or organization does not imply a client relationship, endorsement or partnership.

Website: https://intuitionlabs.ai

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.