OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

Journal of Clinical Trials

ISSN: 2167-0870

Perspective

Evaluating the Impact of Telemedicine-Based Clinical Trial Monitoring in Oncology Studies

Kyle Yu*

Department of Surgery, University of California, California, USA

DESCRIPTION

The conduct of oncology clinical trials often involves complex protocols, frequent monitoring visits and close follow-up with patients undergoing intensive treatment regimens. These requirements can place a substantial burden on both participants and research teams. Traditional in-person monitoring, though standard, has limitations in terms of flexibility, cost and access. The emergence of telemedicine platforms presents an opportunity to reimagine clinical trial oversight, particularly in the field of oncology where patient vulnerability and logistical challenges are heightened. This study evaluated the feasibility, quality outcomes and participant satisfaction associated with telemedicine-based monitoring in ongoing oncology clinical trials.

The analysis was conducted across five cancer centers participating in multi-phase trials for solid and hematological malignancies. Each site was involved in at least two phase 2 or phase 3 studies requiring regular monitoring of safety data, adherence and protocol compliance. Over a 12-month period, 28 oncology trials were monitored using a hybrid model: alternating between traditional on-site monitoring visits and virtual sessions conducted *via* secure telemedicine platforms. Virtual monitoring involved video conferencing, electronic source data review, remote access to laboratory reports and digital Case Report Form (CRF) audits.

The primary outcomes of interest were protocol deviation detection rates, query resolution times, data entry timeliness and overall monitoring efficiency. Secondary outcomes included participant adherence, visit completion rates and satisfaction scores from investigators, coordinators and trial participants. Telemedicine sessions were scheduled in accordance with sponsor agreements and aligned with the frequency of scheduled site visits.

Protocol deviation identification was comparable between remote and on-site monitoring. Across all trials, 174 protocol deviations were documented during the evaluation period, with 91 identified during remote sessions and 83 during in-person visits. No significant differences were noted in deviation types or severity. Most deviations related to delayed assessments or missed documentation. The rate of missed or misclassified adverse events did not differ between monitoring modes, suggesting that remote monitoring maintained safety oversight standards.

Query resolution was faster during remote sessions. The average time to close data queries was reduced by 18% compared to in-person monitoring, partly due to more immediate interaction and shorter wait times for clarification. Data entry was also timelier in the hybrid model, as trial coordinators were able to update electronic CRFs in real time during virtual sessions. This improved data currency and enabled quicker interim analyses for ongoing trials.

The implementation of telemonitoring led to a 26% reduction in monitoring costs, largely attributed to fewer travel-related expenses and lower administrative overhead. Monitoring staff reported improved scheduling flexibility, which allowed them to support multiple sites concurrently without the limitations imposed by physical travel. Trial sponsors and Contract Research Organizations (CROs) also expressed support for the model due to improved resource allocation.

Patient outcomes were not negatively affected by the transition to remote monitoring. Adherence to treatment protocols and scheduled visits remained stable across the study period. Visit completion rates were slightly higher in the latter half of the year, potentially due to increased participant engagement and staff availability during virtual oversight. Importantly, the remote model enabled continued monitoring even during periods of travel restriction or when immunocompromised patients were advised to limit in-person interactions.

Participant feedback was gathered through structured interviews and anonymous surveys. Over 80% of patients reported feeling confident that the quality of care and trial oversight remained consistent. Many appreciated the increased privacy and reduced disruption to their routine. Some expressed a preference for continuing virtual engagement when feasible. However, a minority of participants, particularly older adults unfamiliar with video conferencing tools, encountered initial difficulties in

Correspondence to: Kyle Yu, Department of Surgery, University of California, California, USA, E-mail: kyleyu@gmail.com

Received: 30-Jun-2025, Manuscript No. JCTR-25-37923; **Editor assigned:** 03-Jul-2025, PreQC No. JCTR-25-37923 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 17-Jul-2025, QC No. JCTR-25-37923; **Revised:** 24-Jul-2025, Manuscript No. JCTR-25-37923 (R); **Published:** 31-Jul-2025, DOI: 10.35248/2167-0870.25.15.601

Citation: Yu K (2025). Evaluating the Impact of Telemedicine-Based Clinical Trial Monitoring in Oncology Studies. Clin Trials. 15:601.

Copyright: © 2025 Yu K. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

using the platform. Technical support and user education were essential components of the telemedicine rollout.

Clinical investigators and site coordinators responded positively to the hybrid model. Benefits cited included better time management, fewer scheduling conflicts and reduced strain on site infrastructure. However, certain limitations were noted. For trials involving investigational product accountability or procedures requiring physical verification, remote monitoring was less suitable. In such cases, hybrid approaches that combined digital review with occasional on-site verification were preferred.

The study highlighted several enablers of successful telemedicine integration, including robust data security protocols, user-friendly interfaces and reliable internet connectivity. Clear communication channels and predefined agendas enhanced the productivity of virtual sessions. Cross-training staff on digital documentation practices ensured consistency in monitoring quality regardless of mode.

Challenges included initial resistance to change, variable sponsor policies on electronic source verification and occasional technical glitches during video calls. Overcoming these required coordinated efforts, updated standard operating procedures and flexibility in adapting to trial-specific requirements. Data privacy and compliance with regional regulations, such as GDPR and HIPAA, were prioritized through encryption and access controls.

In conclusion, this multi-site evaluation demonstrated that telemedicine-based clinical trial monitoring in oncology studies is feasible, efficient and well accepted by both participants and site personnel. The hybrid approach preserved the integrity of safety and data oversight while offering logistical and economic advantages. As clinical research adapts to a changing healthcare landscape, incorporating tele-monitoring can improve trial accessibility, maintain protocol compliance and ensure continuity of care in vulnerable patient populations. Further refinement of platforms and integration of real-time data from wearable devices and home-based assessments may expand the scope of remote monitoring in future oncology trials.