

Clinical Investigation Plan (CIP)

Title: EpiSave Step 2: A Multi-Center, Event-Driven Clinical Investigation to Assess the Real-World Performance of the EpiSave Seizure Detection Ecosystem in People with Epilepsy and Generalized Convulsive Seizures in Ambulatory Settings

Short title : EpiSave Step 2: Outpatient Validation Study

Type of investigation:	Clinical investigation concerning medical devices (interventional)
Categorisation:	Category C
Registration:	To be determined
Identifier:	To be determined
Sponsor-Investigator:	Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois (CHUV) Address : Rue du Bugnon 46, 1011 Lausanne, Switzerland Contact Person : Prof. Dr. med. Philippe Ryvlin Email : philippe.ryvlin@chuv.ch Phone : +41 21 314 39 66
Sponsor representative (if the Sponsor is not located in Switzerland)	NA
Medical Device (MD):	Name of the MD: EpiSave EpiSave is a smartwatch application with proprietary Generalized Convulsive Seizures (GCS) detection algorithm developed by the research group NeuroDigital. The application as developed by an Italian company name Uquido. Hardware Platform: Smartwatch, TicWatch Pro 5 (Android Wear OS 2.0+) Software version: EpiSave v2.0 (investigational version)
CIP Version and Date:	CIP Version: 1.0 CIP Version Date: 01/10/2025

Signature Pages

ID number of the investigation : To be determined

Title : **EpiSave Step 2:** A Multi-Center, Event-Driven Clinical Investigation to Assess the Real-World Performance of the EPISAVE Seizure Detection Ecosystem in People with Epilepsy and Generalized Convulsive Seizures in Ambulatory Settings

The Sponsor, the Principal Investigator and the Statistician have approved the CIP version 1.0 (dated 01.10.2025), and confirm hereby to conduct the investigation according to the CIP, the current version of the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki, ISO14155:2020, ICH-GCP as far as applicable, and the local legally applicable requirements.

The Investigator has received the ICF and consider it appropriate for use.

Sponsor-Investigator: Prof.Dr.med Philippe Ryvlin

Place/Date

Signature

Statistician

Place/Date

Signature

Principal Investigator at the local investigational site:

I have read and understood this CIP version [1.0 (dated 01.10.2025)], and agree to conduct the investigation according to the CIP, the current version of the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki, ISO14155:2020, ICH-GCP as far as applicable, and the local legally applicable requirements.

I have received the ICF and consider it appropriate for use.

Site: **HUG - Geneva University Hospitals**

Principal investigator at
the local investigational
site: Pr. S. Vuillemoz

Place/Date

Signature

Site: **USB – Universitätsspital Basel (adult)**

Principal investigator at
the local investigational
site: Dr. M. Hardmeier

Place/Date

Signature

Site: **UKBB - Universitäts-Kinderspital beider Basel (pediatric)**

Principal investigator at
the local investigational
site: Pr. A. Datta

Place/Date

Signature

Site: **InselSpital – Universitätsspital Bern**

Principal investigator at
the local investigational
site: Dr. C. Friedrichs-Maeder

Place/Date

Signature

Site: **USZ – Universitätsspital Zürich (adult)**

Principal investigator at
the local investigational
site: Dr. M. Galovic

Place/Date

Signature

Site: **Klinik Lengg AG, Swiss Epilepsy Center – Zurich**

Principal investigator at
the local investigational
site: Dr. L. Imbach

Place/Date

Signature

Site: **EOC – Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, Lugano Regional
Hospital**

Principal investigator at
the local investigational
site: Dr C. Prosperetti

Place/Date

Signature

Table of Contents

SYNOPSIS	8
ABBREVIATIONS	12
SUMMARY OF THE REVISION HISTORY IN CASE OF AMENDMENTS.....	14
INVESTIGATION SCHEDULE.....	14
1. INVESTIGATION ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE	15
1.1 Sponsor, Sponsor-Investigator.....	15
1.2 Principal Investigator(s).....	15
1.3 Statistician ("Biostatistician")	18
1.4 Laboratory	18
1.5 Monitoring institution	18
1.6 Data Safety Monitoring Committee	18
1.7 Any other relevant Committee, Person, Organisation, Institution	18
2. ETHICAL AND REGULATORY ASPECTS	19
2.1 Registration of the investigation	19
2.2 Categorisation of the investigation	19
2.3 Competent Ethics Committee (CEC)	19
2.3.1 Reporting duties to the Competent Ethics Committee	19
2.4 Competent Authorities (CA)	19
2.4.1 Reporting duties to the competent authorities	20
2.5 Ethical Conduct of the Investigation.....	20
2.6 Declaration of interests.....	20
2.7 Patient Information and Informed Consent	20
2.8 Subject privacy and confidentiality	21
2.9 Early termination of the investigation	21
2.10 Clinical investigation plan amendments	22
2.11 Deviation from the Clinical Investigation Plan	22
3. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE	23
3.1 Background and Rationale for the clinical investigation.....	23
3.2 Identification and description of the Investigational Medical Device	24
3.3 Preclinical Evidence	25
3.4 Clinical Evidence to Date	25
3.5 Justification for the design of the clinical investigation.....	26
3.6 Explanation for choice of comparator.....	27
3.7 Risk evaluation (Risk-to-Benefits rationale)	27
3.8 Justification of the choice of the investigation population	28
3.9 Patient and public involvement	29
4. CLINICAL INVESTIGATION OBJECTIVES	30
4.1 Overall Objective	30
4.2 Primary Objective	30
4.3 Secondary Objectives	30
4.4 Safety Objectives	30
5. CLINICAL INVESTIGATION OUTCOMES	31
5.1 Primary Outcome	31
5.2 Secondary Outcomes.....	31

5.3	Other Outcomes of Interest	31
5.4	Safety Outcomes	31
6.	CLINICAL INVESTIGATION DESIGN	32
6.1	General clinical investigation design and justification of design	32
6.2	Methods for minimising bias	33
6.2.1	Randomisation	33
6.2.2	Blinding procedures	33
6.2.3	Other methods for minimising bias	33
6.3	Unblinding Procedures (Code break)	33
7.	CLINICAL INVESTIGATION POPULATION	34
7.1	Eligibility criteria	34
7.2	Recruitment and screening	35
7.3	Assignment to investigation groups	35
7.4	Criteria for withdrawal / discontinuation of subjects	35
8.	CLINICAL INVESTIGATION INTERVENTION	37
8.1	Identity of the medical device under investigation	37
8.1.1	Experimental Intervention (medical device)	37
8.1.2	Control Intervention (standard/routine/comparator)	37
8.1.3	Labelling and Supply (re-supply)	37
8.1.4	Storage Conditions	37
8.2	Discontinuation or modifications of the intervention	37
8.3	Compliance with clinical investigation intervention	37
8.4	Data Collection and Follow-up for withdrawn subjects	38
8.5	Clinical investigation specific preventive measures	38
8.6	Concomitant Interventions (treatments)	38
8.7	Medical Device Accountability	38
8.8	Return, Analysis or Destruction of the Medical Device	38
9.	CLINICAL INVESTIGATION ASSESSMENTS	39
9.1	Clinical investigation flow chart(s) / table of clinical investigation procedures and assessments	39
9.2	Assessments of outcomes	39
9.2.1	Assessment of primary outcome	39
9.2.2	Assessment of secondary outcomes	39
9.2.3	Assessment of other outcomes of interest	39
9.2.4	Assessment of safety outcomes	40
9.2.5	Assessments in subjects who prematurely stop the clinical investigation	41
9.2.6	Follow-up of the subjects after the regular termination of the clinical investigation	41
9.3	Procedures at each visit	41
9.3.1	Split into subtitles by type of visit	41
9.3.2	Split into subtitles by type of visit	Erreur ! Signet non défini.
9.3.3	Split into subtitles by type of visit	Erreur ! Signet non défini.
10.	SAFETY	42
10.1	Definition and Assessment of (Serious) Adverse Events and other safety related events	42
10.2	Adverse events categorization	43
10.3	Documentation and reporting in Medical Device Category C clinical investigations	43
10.3.1	Foreseeable adverse events and anticipated adverse device effects	43
10.3.2	Documentation of device deficiencies and adverse events by the investigator	43

10.3.3 Reporting of (Serious) Adverse Events, device deficiencies, and other safety related events	44
10.3.4 Follow-up of (Serious) Adverse Events.....	45
10.4 Documentation and reporting in Medical Device Category A clinical investigations	45
10.4.1 Foreseeable adverse events and anticipated adverse device effects	46
10.4.2 Reporting of Safety related events.....	46
10.5 Assessment, notification and reporting on the use of radiation sources.....	47
11. STATISTICAL METHODS.....	48
11.1 Hypothesis.....	48
11.2 Determination of Sample Size.....	48
11.3 Statistical criteria of termination of the investigation	48
11.4 Planned Analyses.....	48
11.4.1 Datasets to be analysed, analysis populations	48
11.4.2 Primary Analysis	48
11.4.3 Secondary Analyses	48
11.4.4 Interim analyses	49
11.4.5 Deviation(s) from the original statistical plan	49
11.5 Handling of missing data and drop-outs.....	49
12. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTROL.....	50
12.1 Data handling and record keeping / archiving.....	50
12.1.1 Case Report Forms.....	50
12.1.2 Specification of source data and source documents	50
12.1.3 Archiving of essential clinical investigation documents	50
12.2 Data management.....	51
12.2.1 Data Management System	51
12.2.2 Data security, access and back-up	51
12.2.3 Analysis and archiving	51
12.2.4 Electronic and central data validation	51
12.3 Monitoring.....	51
12.4 Audits and Inspections	52
12.5 Confidentiality, Data Protection.....	52
12.6 Storage of biological material and related health data.....	52
13. PUBLICATION AND DISSEMINATION POLICY.....	53
14. FUNDING AND SUPPORT.....	54
14.1 Funding	54
14.2 Other Support.....	54
15. INSURANCE.....	54
16. REFERENCES.....	55
17. APPENDICES.....	56

SYNOPSIS

Sponsor-Investigator	Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois (CHUV)
Title:	EpiSave Step 2 A Multi-Center, Event-Driven Clinical Investigation to Assess the Real-World Performance of the EpiSave Seizure Detection Ecosystem in People with Epilepsy and Generalized Convulsive Seizures (GCS) in Ambulatory Settings
Short title / Investigation ID:	EpiSave Step 2 : Outpatient Validation Study
Clinical Investigation Plan, version and date:	CIP Version: 1.0 CIP Version Date: 01/10/2025
Registration:	ClinicalTrials.gov: [Registration number to be assigned] EU-CTR: [Registration number to be assigned] Swiss National Portal: HumRes
Category and its rationale:	Category: Medical Device Category C (Sub-category C2) Risk Level: Moderate risk Justification: This clinical investigation involves the EpiSave smartwatch application (software version v2.0), which is not CE-marked as a medical device under Article 13 MedDO. Although the hardware platform (TicWatch Pro 5) is CE-marked, the investigational software used for seizure detection is not certified for medical use. Therefore, the study falls under Category C, specifically Sub-category C2, as per Art. 6(3)(b) ClinO-MD: “The device to be investigated does not carry a conformity marking in accordance with Article 13 MedDO.” The investigational use of the EpiSave system is interventional and aims to assess its performance and safety in real-world ambulatory settings. Approval from Swissmedic is required under the ClinO-MD ordinance.
Name of the MD, Unique Device Identification (UDI), name of the manufacturer	Name of the MD: EpiSave EpiSave is a smartwatch application with proprietary GCS detection algorithm developed by the research group NeuroDigital. The application as developed by an Italian company name Uquido. Smartwatch: TicWatch Pro 5 (Android Wear OS 2.0+) Software version: EpiSave E v2.0 (investigational version)
Stage of development:	Pivotal stage The purpose of this study is to generate robust clinical data on the safety and performance of the device

Background and rationale:	<p>Epilepsy affects approximately 60 million people worldwide, with 25-30% experiencing GCS. GCS represent one of the most severe forms of epileptic seizures and are associated with increased risks of physical injury, sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP), and significant impact on quality of life.</p> <p>Current medically certified seizure detection solutions suffer from critical limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High false-alarm rates (>1/week) - Substantial costs (\$250-1,500 USD plus monthly fees) - Limited availability (night-only operation for some devices) - Stigmatizing dedicated wrist devices - Lack of reimbursement in most countries <p>The EpiSave system addresses these limitations through an innovative Android-based smartwatch application designed to detect GCS with high sensitivity and low false alarm rates. The development follows a standardized framework, with EpiSave having successfully completed phase 2 testing, which involved algorithm development and offline validation on data previously collected in EMU where video-EEG serves as a gold standard.</p>
Objectives:	<p>Primary objective: To assess EpiSave sensitivity for video-confirmed nocturnal GCS detection in real-world ambulatory settings</p> <p>Secondary objective: evaluate the system's performance in detecting GCS during different time periods, evaluate false alarm rate, caregiver response, seizure duration precision, device usability, quality of life impact</p>
Outcomes:	<p>Primary outcome: EpiSave sensitivity for video-confirmed nocturnal GCS detection</p> <p>Secondary outcomes: false alarm rate, caregiver response time, seizure duration precision, device usability score, quality of life Impact</p>
Design:	<p>Prospective, interventional, multi-centre, event-driven clinical investigation</p> <p>Single-arm, open-label study</p>
Inclusion / exclusion criteria:	<p>Patients eligible for inclusion in the study must meet all of the following criteria: be over 6 years of age at the time of enrolment; have a confirmed diagnosis of drug-resistant epilepsy, documented by a neurologist; have experienced ≥ 2 GCS in the past 12 months, including ≥ 2 nocturnal GCS per year; be able to wear and feel comfortable wearing a smartwatch; own a compatible smartphone; have a caregiver living nearby who can intervene quickly if needed; provide informed consent (or have it provided by a legal guardian, if applicable).</p> <p>Participants will be excluded if they meet any of the following criteria: Age < 6 years, uncertain or unconfirmed diagnosis of drug-resistant epilepsy; GCS frequency < 2 GCS during the last 12 months or < 2 nocturnal GCS per year; not be able or not feel comfortable wearing a smartwatch; haven't a caregiver living nearby who can intervene quickly if needed; unable to provide informed consent or assent and no legal representative available.</p> <p>Vulnerable Participants: The EpiSave study include paediatric participants (6-17 years) and those with cognitive limitations, as these vulnerable populations are particularly at risk of SUDEP, especially due to their inability to alert others or reposition themselves after a generalized seizure. Their inclusion is essential to evaluate the effectiveness of seizure detection devices, as their specific needs cannot be studied indirectly.</p>

Measurements and procedures:	The participant must wear the smartwatch continuously during the day, with the application active, preferably on the wrist of the non-dominant arm. The smartwatch provides continuous 24/7 monitoring and records PPG data for 15 minutes following each detected seizure. The EpiSave algorithm detects GCS in real time and automatically sends an SMS alert to the designated caregiver, notifying them of the seizure event and the patient's geographic location. The patient will complete questionnaires on quality of life and device usability. To confirm whether nocturnal seizures are occurring, participants will be asked to install a camera at home and record themselves overnight.
Intervention:	<p>Device: EpiSave smartwatch application with proprietary GCS detection algorithm</p> <p>Hardware Platform: Smartwatch, TicWatch Pro 5 (Android Wear OS 2.0+)</p> <p>Specifications: 3D accelerometer (50Hz), gyroscope (50Hz), PPG sensor, SpO2 sensor, GPS, Bluetooth 4.0+, 22-hour battery life, IP67 water resistance</p> <p>Core Application: EpiSave v2.0 (investigational version)</p> <p>Duration of intervention: 6 months per participant, up to 24 months total recruitment period.</p> <p>Mode of Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuous monitoring of motion data via smartwatch 3D-accelerometry sensor - Real-time analysis using proprietary GCS detection algorithm - Upon seizure detection: collection of additional biosignals for 15 minutes post-seizure - Automated dual-alert system to patient and caregiver
Control intervention (if applicable):	<p>No Active Comparator (Single-arm study design)</p> <p>Historical Controls: Comparison with published performance metrics from current certified devices</p> <p>Internal Controls: Comparison with Phase 2 EMU validation results</p>
Number of subjects with rationale:	Recruitment of up to 100 patients.
Duration of the investigation:	21 months
Investigation schedule:	<p>First- subject –In (planned): Month 3</p> <p>Last- subject –Out (planned): Month 18-20</p>

Investigators:	<p>Prof. Dr. med. Philippe Ryvlin Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois (CHUV) Address: Rue du Bugnon 46, 1011 Lausanne, Switzerland Email: philippe.ryvlin@chuv.ch Phone: +41 21 314 39 66</p> <p>Prof. G Ramantani Pr. S. Vuillemoz Dr. M. Hardmeier Dr. O. Henning Pr. A. Datta Dr. C. Friedrichs-Maeder Dr. M. Galovic Dr. L. Imbach Dr C. Prosperetti Pr. C. Baumgartner Pr. E. Trinkka Pr. S. Beniczky Pr. S. Rheims Pr. M. Holtkamp Pr. R. Surges Pr. F. Rosenow</p>
Investigational Site:	<p>Multicentric multinational investigation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6 centres in Switzerland (Lausanne, Geneva, Basel, Berne, Zürich, Lugano) - 3 centres in Germany (Frankfurt, Bonn, Berlin) - 2 centres in Austria (Vienna, Salzburg) - 2 centres in Denmark (Copenhagen, Dianalund) - 1 centre in France (Lyon) - 1 centre in Norway (Oslo)
Statistical considerations:	<p>Regulatory Requirement: Aligns with FDA/CE guidelines for medical device validation studies</p> <p>Literature-Based: Based on published recommendations for phase 4 seizure detection studies</p> <p>Power Calculation: Provides 90% power to detect sensitivity $\geq 90\%$ with 95% confidence</p> <p>Event-Driven Design: Ensures adequate statistical power regardless of recruitment timeline</p> <p>Dropout Consideration: Accounts for 20% anticipated dropout rate</p> <p>Recruitment Timeline: 24 months (≤ 1 PWE/4 months/centre)</p>
Compliance statement:	<p>This investigation will be conducted in full compliance with the CIP, the current version of the Declaration of Helsinki, ISO 14155:2020 ICH-GCP (as far as applicable) as well as all national legal and regulatory requirements.</p>

ABBREVIATIONS

AE	Adverse Event
ADE	Adverse Device Effect
ASADE	Anticipated Serious Adverse Device Effect
CA	Competent Authority (e.g. Swissmedic)
CE	European Conformity marking
CEC	Competent Ethics Committee
CIP	Clinical investigation plan
ClinO	Ordinance on Clinical Trials in Human Research (<i>in German KlinV, in French Oclin, in Italian OSRUm</i>)
ClinO-MD	Ordinance on Clinical Trials with Medical Devices (<i>in German: KlinV-Mep, in French: Oclin-Dim, in Italian: OSRUm-Dmed</i>)
CRF	Case Report Form (pCRF paper CRF; eCRF electronic CRF)
DD	Device Deficiency
DMC / DSMC	Data Monitoring Committee, Data Safety Monitoring Committee
FADP	Federal Act Data Protection
FBTCS	Focal to Bilateral Tonic-Clonic Seizures
GCS	Generalized Convulsive Seizures
GDPR	EU General Data Protection Regulation
GTCS	Generalized Tonic-Clonic Seizures
Ho	Null hypothesis
H1	Alternative hypothesis
HRA	Federal Act on Research involving Human Beings (<i>in German: HFG, in French: LRH, in Italian: LRUm</i>)
IB	Investigator's Brochure
ICF	Informed Consent Form
ICH-GCP	International Council for Harmonisation – guidelines of Good Clinical Practice
IECs	Independent Ethics Committees
IFU	Instruction For Use
IRBs	Institutional Review Boards
ISF	Investigator Site File
ISO	International Organisation for Standardisation
ITT	Intention to treat
MedDO	Medical Devices Ordinance (<i>in German: MepV, in French: Odim, in Italian: Odmed</i>)
MD	Medical Device
MDR	Medical Device Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of 5 April 2017
PI	Principal Investigator
QOLIE-31	Quality Of Life in Epilepsy Inventory

SADE	Serious Adverse Device Effect
SAE	Serious Adverse Event
SDV	Source Data Verification
SUDEP	Sudden Unexpected Death in Epilepsy
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
HumRes	Swiss Human Research Portal
USADE	Unanticipated Serious Adverse Device Effect

SUMMARY OF THE REVISION HISTORY IN CASE OF AMENDMENTS

Version Nr, Version Date	Chapter	Description of change	Reason for the change

INVESTIGATION SCHEDULE

Investigation Periods	Screening	Follow-up visits each month by phone during monitoring with smartwatch and camera					End of study
Visit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Time (week)	0	4	8	12	16	20	24
Patient Information	x						
Patient consent (ICF)	x						
Demographics	x						
Medical History	x						
In- /Exclusion Criteria	x						
Smartwatch provided to participant	x						
Participant and caregiver training	x						
System validation and testing	x						
Confirmation of alert system functionality	x						
QOLIE-31 questionnaire	x						x
Compliance assessment		x	x	x	x	x	x
Adverse Events, Adverse device effects		x	x	x	x	x	x
Device performance evaluation		x	x	x	x	x	x
Data collection verification		x	x	x	x	x	x
Device Deficiencies		x	x	x	x	x	x
Smartwatch return							x
Download and deletion of data from the smartwatch							x
SUS questionnaire							x
Custom EpiSave questionnaire							x

1. INVESTIGATION ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

1.1 Sponsor, Sponsor-Investigator

The sponsor of this investigation is the CHUV | Centre hospitalier universitaire vaudois. The CHUV is responsible for initiating, designing, and overseeing the clinical investigation, ensuring regulatory, ethical, financial, and legal compliance. They manage data collection, monitoring, and analysis, and ensure the integrity of results. The sponsor also prepares and submits the final clinical report. If acting as Sponsor-Investigator, they additionally conduct the study directly at the investigation site.

Sponsor contact details:

- Address: Rue du Bugnon 46, 1011 Lausanne, Switzerland
- Contact Person: Prof. Dr. med. Philippe Ryvlin
- Email: philippe.ryvlin@chuv.ch
- Phone: +41 21 314 39 66

1.2 Principal Investigators

Swiss Centres:

Investigator of the CHUV | Centre hospitalier universitaire vaudois

Name: Prof. Dr. med. Philippe Ryvlin

Title: Professor of Neurology, Head of Epileptology

Address: Rue du Bugnon 46, 1011 Lausanne, Switzerland

Email : philippe.ryvlin@chuv.ch

Phone : +41 21 314 3966

Investigator of the HUG - Geneva University Hospitals

Name: Pr. S. Vuillemoz

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of USB – Universitätsspital Basel (adult)

Name: Dr. M. Hardmeier

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of the UKBB - Universitäts-Kinderspital beider Basel (pediatric)

Name: Pr. A. Datta

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of the InselSpital – Universitätsspital Bern

Name: Dr. C. Friedrichs-Maeder

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of the USZ – Universitätsspital Zürich (adult)

Name: Dr. M. Galovic

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of the Klinik Lengg AG, Swiss Epilepsy Center – Zurich

Name: Dr. L. Imbach

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of the EOC – Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, Lugano Regional Hospital

Name: Dr. C. Prosperetti

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Austria Centres:

Investigator of the KL - Karl Landsteiner Institute – Vienna

Name: Pr. C. Baumgartner

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of the SALK - Landeskrankenhaus Salzburg – Salzburg

Name: Pr. E. Trinkla

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Denmark Centres:

Investigator of Rigshospitalet – Copenhagen

Name: Pr. S. Beniczky

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of the Filadelfia, The danish Epilepsy Hospital – Dianalund

Name: Pr. S. Beniczky

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

France Centre:

Investigator of HCL - Hospices Civils of Lyon

Name: Pr. S. Rheims

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Germany Centres:

Investigator of Charité, Universitätsmedizin Berlin

Name: Pr. M. Holtkamp

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of UKB – Universitätsklinikum Bonn

Name: Pr. R. Surges

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Investigator of University Hospital Frankfurt

Name: Pr. F. Rosenow

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Norway Centre:

Investigator of Oslo University Hospital

Name: Pr. M. Lossius

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

1.3 Statistician ("Biostatistician")

Name: Mireille Moser

Title: Master in Statistics

Address: Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois (CHUV)

Email: mireille.moser@chuv.ch

Tel: +41 79 556 28 75

Role: Statistical analysis and study design consultation

1.4 Laboratory

NA

1.5 Monitoring institution

The investigation will be internally monitored by the Clinical Research Unit of the CHUV.

1.6 Data Safety Monitoring Committee

The Independent Data Safety Monitoring Board (DSMC) is composed of neurologist, statistician and ethicist in order to safe oversight and interim analysis review.

1.7 Any other relevant Committee, Person, Organisation, Institution

NA

2 ETHICAL AND REGULATORY ASPECTS

The final positive decision of the CEC and of the CA on the conduct of the investigation will be made and given in writing to the Sponsor before the investigation can start ([Category C investigations](#): In Switzerland the national approval is issued by Swissmedic and includes the approval of the CEC). Additional requirements set by the authorities must be implemented.

2.1 Registration of the investigation

Registry	Registration number	Date
ClinicalTrials.gov	NCT	Not obtained yet
EU Clinical Trials Register (EU-CTR)	EudraCT	Not obtained yet
Swiss National Portal	HumRes	Not obtained yet

2.2 Categorisation of the investigation

The investigational device used in this study is the EpiSave smartwatch application (v2.0), designed to detect GCS and alert caregivers in real time. While the hardware platform (TicWatch Pro 5) is CE-marked in accordance with Article 13 MedDO, the EpiSave software itself is an investigational application that does not bear a conformity mark as a medical device.

Furthermore, the application is used in a clinical investigation setting, outside the scope of its certified intended use, and is not yet approved for medical use in Switzerland. Therefore, the study falls under Category C, specifically Subcategory C2, as defined in Art. 6(3)(b) ClinO-MD:

“The product does not bear a conformity mark according to Article 13 MedDO.”

This categorisation requires submission to Swissmedic and approval prior to study initiation. The classification reflects the investigational nature of the software and ensures appropriate regulatory oversight for safety and performance evaluation.

2.3 Competent Ethics Committee (CEC)

The Sponsor-Investigator will submit the investigation to the CEC and obtain ethical committee approval before the start of the investigation. Each PI at each participating investigational site ensures that approval from the CEC is obtained and filed in the Investigator site file before the investigation starts.

2.3.1 Reporting duties to the Competent Ethics Committee

Amendments are reported according to Art. 15 ClinO-MD (see also 2.10).

The regular or premature end of the investigation as well as the interruption of the investigation is reported to the CEC within 15 days (within 24 hours if it is due to security reasons) (Art. 36 ClinO-MD). The reasons for a premature end or an interruption have to be explained.

A final report shall be submitted within one year after the regular end of the investigation and within 3 months after a premature end of the investigation. A summary in easily understandable terms must be included with the final report (Art. 37 ClinO-MD).

2.4 Competent Authorities (CA)

The Sponsor-Investigator will submit the investigation to the CA and obtain regulatory approval before the start of the investigation. Each PI at each participating investigational site ensures that approval from the CA is obtained and filed in the Investigator site file before the investigation starts.

2.4.1 Reporting duties to the competent authorities

Mention the reporting duties and allowed time frame for the reporting to the CA including the reporting duties in case of planned or premature end of the investigation and the final report. Reporting duties and timelines are the same as for CEC, except of non-substantial amendments that shall be reported as soon as possible (Art. 20 ClinO-MD). Refer to chapter 10 for safety reporting. Amendments are reported according to Art. 20 ClinO-MD (see also 2.10). A final report shall be submitted within one year after the regular end of the investigation and within 3 months after a premature end of the investigation. A summary in easily understandable terms must be included with the final report (Art. 38, resp. 37 ClinO-MD).

Amendments to the CIP are reported according to Art. 20 ClinO-MD (see also chapter 2.10).

For safety reporting including reporting of safety and protective measures, as well as the safety and general progress report (jointly “annual report”) refer to chapter 10.

The regular or premature termination of the investigation as well as the interruption of the investigation is reported to the CA within 15 days and within 24 hours if it is due to safety reasons (Art. 36 ClinO-MD). The reasons for a premature termination or an interruption shall be explained.

A final report is submitted within one year after the regular end of the investigation and within 3 months after a premature end of the investigation. A summary in easily understandable terms will be included with the final report (Art. 37 ClinO-MD).

2.5 Ethical Conduct of the Investigation

The investigation will be carried out according to the CIP and with principles enunciated in the current version of the Declaration of Helsinki, the European Regulation on medical devices 2017/745 (MDR), the Norms ISO14155 and ISO14971, the ICH-guidelines of Good Clinical Practice (GCP) as applicable, the Swiss Human Research Act (HRA) and its Ordinances and Swiss regulatory authority's requirements.

2.6 Declaration of interests

All investigators and study personnel will declare any potential conflicts of interest (independence, intellectual, financial, proprietary etc.). No financial interests in the EpiSave device or competing products are permitted.

2.7 Patient Information and Informed Consent

The PI explains to each subject the nature of the investigation, its purpose, the procedures involved, the expected duration, the potential risks and benefits and any discomfort it may entail. Each subject is informed that the participation in the investigation is voluntary and that he/she may withdraw from the investigation at any time and that withdrawal of consent will not affect his/her subsequent medical assistance and treatment. The subjects are informed that he/she can ask any question, and consult with family members, friends, their treating physicians or other experts before deciding about their participation in the investigation. Enough time is given to the subjects.

The subjects are informed that authorised individuals other than their treating physician may examine his/her medical records. All subjects are given a subject information sheet and a consent form describing the investigation and providing sufficient information for the subjects to make an informed decision about their participation in the investigation. The formal consent of a subject, using the consent form approved by the CEC, is obtained before the subject is submitted to any study procedure. The subject should read, understand, and voluntarily agree before signing and dating the informed consent form and is given a copy of the signed document. The consent form is signed and dated by the subject and the PI (or her/his designee, when applicable). The subjects are informed, with their approval, that their personal physicians are informed about the subjects' participation in the clinical investigation, when applicable. The signed consent form is retained as part of the clinical investigation documents. The subject's medical records are clearly marked to indicate that the subject is enrolled in the clinical investigation. The subject is provided with well-defined procedures for possible emergency situations related to the performance study. The PI makes the necessary arrangements for emergency treatment.

All participants, including vulnerable individuals such as children and those with cognitive impairments, receive an information sheet and a consent form that clearly describe the study and provide sufficient details to support an informed decision regarding participation. For minors, consent is obtained from their legal guardians, and assent is sought from the child when appropriate. For participants with impaired decision-making capacity, consent is obtained from a legal representative.

The consent process includes simplified materials and additional support to ensure participant understanding. Consent or assent must be given voluntarily and is documented by the signature and date of the participant, their legal representative or parent, and the principal investigator or designated study staff. A copy of the signed consent form is provided to the participant or their representative, while the original is retained in the study records.

Participants who do not wish to take part in the study are not enrolled. Additional safeguards are implemented for vulnerable populations, including simplified consent procedures, enhanced monitoring, and regular reassessment of consent or assent throughout the study. Participants retain the right to withdraw from the study at any time and may request information regarding the progress and results of the study.

2.8 Subject privacy and confidentiality

The Sponsor and the PI affirm and uphold the principle of the subjects' right to privacy and that they shall comply with applicable privacy laws. Especially, anonymity of the subjects shall be guaranteed when presenting the data at scientific meetings or publishing them in scientific journals.

The investigator has appropriate knowledge and skills in the areas of data security and data protection or is able to ensure compliance by calling in appropriate expertise (Art. 5, ClinO-MD).

Individual subject medical information obtained as a result of this investigation is considered confidential and disclosure to third parties is prohibited.

The complete project raw data from the smartwatches shall be handled with utmost discretion and will only be accessible to the study personnel at the CHUV. However, only CHUV personnel will have access to the coding key, during and after the research project. Access to the protocol is reserved to the project partners, and other individuals who are directly implicated. A password-protected Excel-based log will be prepared, called "subject information", which contains the patient names, dates of birth and attributes the subject ID code via the formula, study ID + centre acronym + patient number (e.g. EPI-CHV-001 for CHUV, EPI-HUG-001 for HUG, etc.). Only the investigators at each site will have access to the identities of the patients enrolled at their respective centres. Access to subject ID codes, both during and after the study, will be restricted to locally involved study personnel. The code may only be broken if it is necessary to avert an immediate risk to health of the person concerned, to guarantee the rights of the person (e.g. in revoking the consent), or if a legal basis exists for breaking the code.

Project data will be handled with uttermost discretion and is only accessible to authorized personnel who require the data to fulfil their duties within the scope of the research project. On the CRFs and other project specific documents, participants are only identified by a unique participant number.

The Principal Investigator and participating institutions shall permit investigation-related monitoring, audits, review by Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)/Independent Ethics Committees (IECs), and regulatory inspections. To support these activities, direct access to all relevant source data and documents (including medical records and informed consent forms) will be granted to authorized personnel. This access will be provided in compliance with applicable data protection regulations, including the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection (FADP) and the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

For data verification purposes, authorised representatives of the Sponsor, the CA or a CEC may require direct access to parts of the medical records relevant to the investigation, including subjects' medical history.

2.9 Early termination of the investigation

The Sponsor may terminate the investigation prematurely according to certain circumstances, for example:

- Safety concerns,
- Regulatory authority decision,
- Sponsor decision,
- Insufficient subject recruitment,
- Alterations in accepted clinical practice that make the continuation of the investigation unwise,
- Early evidence of benefit or harm of the experimental intervention

2.10 Clinical investigation plan amendments

Amendments to the Clinical Investigation Plan may only be initiated and approved by the Sponsor. Suggestions may be submitted by investigators, clinical experts, or regulatory authorities, but require Sponsor approval before implementation.

Substantial amendments (e.g., changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses, or safety procedures) will be promptly communicated to all relevant parties, including: investigators, Competent Authorities, ethics Committees (CEC/IRB/IEC), study participants (if applicable), Clinical trial registries, Scientific journals (if previously published), other stakeholders directly involved.

All amendments will be documented, dated, and version-controlled, and the latest CIP version will be made available to study personnel. Updated consent forms will be provided and re-consent obtained if required by regulations.

Substantial amendments are only implemented after approval by the CEC (Art. 15 ClinO-MD) and, for category C investigations, after approval by the CA also (Art. 20 ClinO-MD). The use of waivers from the CIP is prohibited (Annex XV, Chapter 2, Art. 3.10 MDR).

Under emergency circumstances, deviations from the CIP to protect the rights, safety and well-being of the subjects may proceed without prior approval by the Sponsor and the CEC (and for category C investigations without prior approval by the CA). Such deviations shall be documented and reported to the Sponsor and the CEC (and to the CA for category C investigations) within 2 days (Art. 34 ClinO-MD).

All non-substantial amendments are communicated to the CEC annually together with the safety report / general progress report of the clinical investigation (Art. 15 ClinO-MD), and for category C clinical investigations to the CA as soon as possible (Art. 20 ClinO-MD). The report will include any deviations from the CIP that may have affected the rights, safety or well-being of the subject or the scientific integrity of the investigation (ISO14155).

2.11 Deviation from the Clinical Investigation Plan

The use of waivers from the CIP is prohibited (Annex XV, Chapter 2, Art. 3.10 MDR).

3 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

3.1 Background and Rationale for the clinical investigation

3.1.1 Clinical Need and Medical Problem

Epilepsy is a chronic neurological disorder characterized by recurrent, unprovoked seizures, affecting approximately 50 million people worldwide, making it one of the most common neurological diseases globally (1). The International League Against Epilepsy (ILAE) defines epilepsy as a disease of the brain characterized by an enduring predisposition to generate epileptic seizures and by the neurobiologic, cognitive, psychological, and social consequences of this condition (1).

Among the various seizure types, generalized convulsive seizures (GCS), including generalized tonic-clonic seizures (GTCS) and focal to bilateral tonic-clonic seizures (FBTCS), represent one of the most severe manifestations of epilepsy. These seizures are associated with a 15-20 times higher risk of sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP) compared to other seizure types (2), with physical injury occurring in 30-50% of GCS episodes including falls, fractures, and head trauma. The significant impact on quality of life encompasses fear of seizures, social stigma, and activity restrictions, while the economic burden is substantial with direct and indirect costs estimated at \$15.5 billion annually in the United States alone (9).

Drug-resistant epilepsy affects approximately 30% of individuals with epilepsy, defined as failure to achieve sustained seizure freedom despite adequate trials of at least two appropriately chosen and tolerated anti-seizure medications (ASMs). This population faces particularly high risks, with SUDEP rates of 1.1-5.9 per 1,000 person-years, compared to 0.1-0.3 per 1,000 person-years in the general epilepsy population (2,3). The devastating nature of SUDEP is underscored by the fact that it affects approximately 60,000 people with epilepsy worldwide each year, with an incidence of 1.2/1,000 patient-years (3,4), often affecting young adults as well as children and adolescents (5,6), particularly those with developmental and epileptic encephalopathies (DEE) where the incidence can reach 6/1,000 patient-years in conditions such as Dravet syndrome (7,8).

3.1.2 Nocturnal Seizures and SUDEP Risk

Nocturnal GCS represent a critical clinical challenge due to their association with SUDEP, which accounts for 8-17% of all deaths in people with epilepsy (2). The term "unexpected" reflects the fact that most patients and their families are unaware of SUDEP risk, as they are rarely informed by their physicians (10). SUDEP victims are typically found deceased in bed by family members or caregivers (11,12), who often report profound and lasting grief, guilt, and trauma. Many families believe that a reliable GCS detection device could have saved their loved ones.

Most SUDEP cases are precipitated by a GCS followed by a fatal post-ictal respiratory arrest, frequently exacerbated by the prone position (12). These events usually occur at night, while the individual is sleeping alone, limiting the chance for timely intervention (12,13). Established risk factors include the presence, frequency and nocturnal occurrence of GCS, living or sleeping alone, and non-adherence to antiseizure medication (13-17). Recently, additional risk factors have been identified, such as peri-ictal apnea (16,17), extratemporal epileptogenic zones (particularly perisylvian) (19), high body mass index (18-21), and lower polygenic risk scores for longevity and intelligence (21).

Clinical evidence demonstrates that nocturnal GCS are associated with more severe hypoxemia (oxygen saturation <70% in 50% of cases), increased postictal generalized EEG suppression (PGES), prolonged postictal immobility periods, and higher risk of cardiac arrhythmias and respiratory depression (12). The MORTEMUS study, the most cited original SUDEP study, provided the original description of the sequence of events leading to SUDEP following a GCS, establishing the critical importance of timely intervention during the post-ictal period (12).

3.1.3 Current Limitations in Seizure Detection

Traditional monitoring approaches face significant limitations that compromise effective seizure detection and SUDEP prevention. Patient self-reporting is unreliable, with studies showing that 85% of nocturnal seizures go unreported (36), while caregiver observation is limited by sleep patterns and physical proximity. Inpatient video-EEG monitoring, while providing gold standard data, is expensive, short-term, and not representative of the home environment where most SUDEP events occur (12). Seizure diaries are subject to recall bias and underreporting, further limiting their clinical utility.

The 2020 practice guideline of the International League Against Epilepsy (ILAE) and the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology concluded that there is high-level evidence supporting the

accuracy of automated GCS detection and recommends the use of clinically validated wearable devices in selected patients (34). However, currently available medically certified GCS detection devices face several critical limitations that limit their widespread adoption and effectiveness.

Currently, four medically certified GCS detection devices are available: EpiMonitor (Empatica, wrist-worn, 3D-Acc and EDA), Epi-Care Mobile/Free (Danish Care Technology, wrist-worn, 3D-Acc only), NightWatch (LivAssured, upper arm at night, 3D-Acc and PPG), and EpiWatch (App on the Apple Watch, 3D-Acc and PPG) (35,42-47). While these devices demonstrate varying levels of sensitivity (65-100%) and false alarm rates (0.05-0.7 per day) (42-47), they suffer from several critical limitations including high false alarm rates contributing to "alarm fatigue" and device abandonment, stigmatization and usability issues from wearing dedicated devices, limited functionality including the inability to cancel false alarms, restricted operation windows with some devices designed for nighttime use only, and limited access and affordability especially outside Europe and the United States.

Cost represents a particularly critical barrier to adoption, as most health systems do not reimburse GCS detectors, and many people with drug-resistant epilepsy have limited income to afford their cost. A recent US survey identified cost as the primary reason for non-use of GCS detectors in the United States. Current pricing ranges from \$250-1,500 USD plus monthly fees for most devices, with only EpiWatch available at device cost only but limited to the Apple ecosystem. These limitations result in poor adoption rates, with only 5-10% of eligible patients using seizure detection devices.

3.1.4 Scientific Background and EpiSave Development

The EpiSave system was developed following a standardized framework for seizure detection device validation (41), building upon two SNSF-funded grants (#320030_179240 and #CRSII5_193813) that enabled the creation of the world's largest dataset combining video-EEG and wrist-worn sensor recordings in people with epilepsy, including data from 398 patients and over 600 seizures—104 of which were GCS (55). This unique dataset enabled the development of EpiSave, an innovative deep learning algorithm designed to detect GCS using only 3D accelerometry (55).

The development process involved algorithm development based on the above SNSF-funded projects database containing data from 400+ patients with 100+ GCS events, technical innovation through ensemble-based convolutional neural network architecture with tunable sensitivity, and Phase 2 validation through a multi-center study across eight European epilepsy monitoring units. The algorithm was successfully embedded into a low-cost off-the-shelf Android-based smartwatch (TicWatch Pro) with the help of the Embedded System Laboratory at EPFL, and a professional-grade companion app was developed to implement key functionalities including user account management, caregiver notifications, false alarm cancellation, and secure data streaming.

Phase 2 Clinical Validation Results (55) demonstrated that the EpiSave algorithm was developed and validated through a prospective multi-center study collecting data from 384 patients undergoing video-electroencephalography (vEEG) monitoring with wrist-worn three-dimensional (3D) accelerometer sensors. The training set comprised 37 patients with 54 GCS across 4,922 hours (~206 days) of recording, while the independent test set included 347 patients across 31,479 hours (~1,312 days) of recording, including 33 patients with 49 GCS (55).

Performance metrics demonstrated 96% sensitivity (95% CI: 90%-100%) on the independent test set, with a false alarm rate of <1/8 days (95% CI: 1/9-1/7 days) and 1 false alarm per 61 nights (55). Detection latency was a median of 26 seconds after GCS onset, while the algorithm's tunable sensitivity allows achievement of up to 100% sensitivity or reduction of false alarms to 1/100 days through quantile adjustment (55). The ensemble-based CNN architecture represents a significant advancement in single-sensor CS detection, introducing two key innovations: an ensemble approach providing inherent robustness against individual model variations, and quantile-based aggregation enabling adaptive sensitivity tuning without requiring model retraining, offering clinicians and patients flexibility in balancing detection sensitivity against false alarms (55).

3.2 Identification and description of the Investigational Medical Device

3.2.1 Device Overview

The investigational medical device under evaluation is the EpiSave Seizure Detection System, a Class IIa medical device (proposed) manufactured by NeuroDigital@NeuroTech Group. The device is currently in investigational status for clinical investigation, representing a non-profit academic initiative with no intention to commercialize, ensuring the widest possible access to GCS detection while serving the ultimate goals of reducing SUDEP risk and promoting SUDEP biomarker discovery through large-scale data sharing.

3.2.2 Hardware Platform

The EpiSave system utilizes the TicWatch Pro 5 smartwatch platform running Android Wear OS 2.0+, representing pre-certified hardware in the form of CE-marked off-the-shelf smartwatches. The hardware platform meets comprehensive safety standards including IEC 60601-1 and IEC 60601-1-2 for electromagnetic compatibility, ISO 10993 standards for skin contact biocompatibility, and IEC 62133 battery safety standards.

The technical specifications include a 3D accelerometer with minimum 50Hz sampling rate, gyroscope with minimum 50Hz sampling rate, photoplethysmography (PPG) for heart rate monitoring, blood oxygen saturation (SpO2) monitoring, GPS capability for location services and caregiver alerts, Bluetooth 4.0+ connectivity for data transmission, 24-hour continuous operation battery life, IP67 or higher water resistance, and compatibility with Android 8.0+ and iOS 12.0+ smartphones. These specifications ensure robust performance in real-world ambulatory settings while maintaining user comfort and device reliability.

3.2.3 Software Components

The EpiSave software architecture comprises a core application (EpiSave v2.0 investigational version) designed as an Android Wear OS application with optimized resource requirements including less than 50MB installed size, less than 100MB RAM usage, and less than 200MB storage requirements for data logging. The seizure detection algorithm represents a proprietary machine learning system that processes 3D accelerometry and gyroscope data through real-time signal analysis with less than 2 second latency, utilizing a frozen version 2.0 algorithm (no updates during study) trained on the previous projects database containing data from 400+ patients and 100+ GCS events.

The data collection module provides continuous 24/7 accelerometry and gyroscope recording with 15-minute enhanced monitoring post-detection, ensuring comprehensive seizure documentation. All data is protected through AES-256 encryption for stored data, with local storage utilizing a 7-day rolling buffer system combined with cloud synchronization for data integrity and accessibility.

3.2.4 Communication and Alert System

The EpiSave communication and alert system encompasses a smartphone application compatible with Android (8.0+) and iOS (12.0+) platforms, providing seizure alerts, caregiver notifications, and data synchronization capabilities. The alert system utilizes multiple communication methods including SMS, push notifications, and in-app alerts, with GPS coordinates integrated into seizure alerts for precise location information. The system maintains offline capability through local data storage with synchronization when connectivity is restored, ensuring continuous monitoring even during network interruptions.

The caregiver alert system implements a dual-alert approach with primary alerts delivered via SMS containing patient location and seizure detection time, supplemented by secondary push notifications to the caregiver smartphone app. Alert content includes patient identification, location, timestamp, and seizure type information, while the system incorporates response confirmation mechanisms with caregiver acknowledgment and response time logging to enable assessment of intervention effectiveness and system performance.

3.3 Preclinical Evidence

NA

3.4 Clinical Evidence to Date

3.4.1 Phase 2 Clinical Validation Study

The Phase 2 clinical validation study employed a prospective, multi-center, observational design across eight European epilepsy monitoring units, representing the most comprehensive validation of a seizure detection algorithm to date (55). The study population comprised 384 patients with an age range of 6-80 years, encompassing focal, generalized, and combined epilepsies, with all seizure types included but particular focus on GCS (55). Data collection spanned 4,922 hours of training data and 31,479 hours of test data, utilizing 3D accelerometer at 32Hz sampling rate, with video-EEG monitoring serving as the gold standard for expert annotation (55).

The study documented 54 GCS in the training set and 49 GCS in the test set, providing robust statistical power for performance evaluation (55). Primary results demonstrated 96% sensitivity (95% CI: 90%-100%) on the independent test set, with a false alarm rate of less than 1/8 days (95% CI: 1/9-1/7 days)

and detection latency of median 26 seconds (IQR: 15-45 seconds) (55).

3.4.2 Comparison with Existing Devices

Performance comparison with existing medically certified seizure detection devices demonstrates EpiSave's superior performance across multiple metrics (55). EpiSave achieved 96% sensitivity with less than 1/8 days false alarm rate in a study population of 384 patients over 1,312 days, compared to EpiMonitor (95-98% sensitivity, variable false alarm rate, 135 patients, 6 months), Nightwatch (80-100% sensitivity, 0.7/night false alarm rate, 28 patients, 3 months), and EpiCare Mobile (65-90% sensitivity, variable false alarm rate, 15 patients, 1 month) (42-47). EpiSave's key advantages include higher sensitivity (96% vs. 80-98% for other devices), lower false alarm rate (less than 1/8 days vs. 0.7-1.0 per day), larger validation dataset (384 patients vs. 15-135 patients), longer study duration (1,312 days vs. 1-180 days), and tunable sensitivity adjustable based on patient needs (55).

3.4.3 Real-World Performance Considerations

The transition from EMU to home environment presents both advantages and challenges that necessitate comprehensive ambulatory validation. EMU settings provide controlled environments with continuous video monitoring and expert staff, but represent artificial settings with limited movement and potential stress factors that may not reflect real-world usage patterns. Home environments offer natural settings with typical daily activities and comfort, but present challenges including environmental noise, device wear compliance issues, and variable caregiver availability.

The Phase 2 EMU validation provides proof-of-concept evidence, but real-world ambulatory validation is essential for clinical utility assessment of device performance in actual use conditions, user acceptance evaluation of device usability and patient satisfaction, and safety assessment monitoring of device-related adverse events in home settings. This comprehensive validation approach ensures that EpiSave's performance translates effectively from controlled clinical environments to real-world ambulatory settings where the device will be used by patients and caregivers.

3.5 Justification for the design of the clinical investigation

3.5.1 Study Design Rationale

The study employs an event-driven design targeting ≥ 75 nocturnal GCS events in ≥ 50 participants, which is justified by statistical power providing 90% power to detect sensitivity $\geq 90\%$ with 95% confidence, clinical relevance focusing on the most clinically significant seizure type (nocturnal GCS), and SUDEP prevention addressing the highest-risk period for SUDEP occurrence. These figures correspond to the standards proposed for phase 4 studies of seizure detection devices in ambulatory patients (72), with anticipated recruitment of 65-80% of patients who will eventually suffer a nocturnal GCS for which both video recordings and EpiSave data will be available for analysis, translating into the recruitment of 77 to 100 people with epilepsy over 24 months.

The single-arm, open-label design is appropriate because medical device validation represents the standard approach for device performance studies, historical controls provide sufficient comparison data available from published literature, and clinical equipoise exists as there is no established standard of care for seizure detection devices. This design approach ensures comprehensive evaluation of EpiSave's performance while maintaining scientific rigor and clinical relevance.

3.5.2 Ambulatory Setting Rationale

The ambulatory validation study is essential because environmental differences between home environments and EMU settings may significantly affect device performance, natural daily activities and movement patterns may impact detection accuracy, 24-hour daily wear requirements need validation in real-world conditions, and caregiver integration and alert system effectiveness require real-world testing to ensure optimal clinical utility. This represents a significant methodological advancement for evaluating GCS detector performance at home, which has not been used in previous studies, with all video recordings stored locally on a memory stick within the camera exclusively, with no data transfer or streaming involved to protect patient privacy.

Clinical investigation requirements mandate this approach, as real-world performance data is essential for understanding device effectiveness in clinical practice, user acceptance evaluation requires assessment in natural environments, and safety monitoring needs to capture device-related events in home settings. The study design incorporates autonomous camera systems for nocturnal monitoring to generate ground truth for nocturnal GCS detection in real-world environments, with patients and caregivers invited to show recordings of detected and missed GCS events, as well as false alarms, to

their physician during follow-up visits.

3.5.3 Nocturnal Focus Rationale

The focus on nocturnal GCS detection is justified by the critical role of nocturnal seizures in SUDEP prevention, as 70-80% of SUDEP cases occur during sleep, nocturnal GCS are associated with more severe hypoxemia, postictal immobility periods are longer during sleep, and caregiver response is typically delayed for nocturnal seizures. This nocturnal focus addresses the highest-risk period for SUDEP occurrence and represents the most clinically significant application of seizure detection technology.

The clinical impact encompasses immediate benefits through reliable nocturnal GCS detection for high-risk patients, short-term benefits through timely caregiver intervention potentially reducing SUDEP risk, and long-term benefits through improved quality of life and reduced seizure-related anxiety. The study design specifically targets nocturnal GCS as the primary endpoint, with secondary endpoints including EpiSave sensitivity for daytime and nighttime GCS, false alarm rate, delays between GCS onset and detection, and caregiver intervention times, ensuring comprehensive evaluation of the device's performance across all seizure timing scenarios.

3.6 Explanation for choice of comparator

NA

3.7 Risk evaluation (Risk-to-Benefits rationale)

The investigational medical device used in this study is the EpiSave smartwatch application (v2.0) running on a CE-marked TicWatch Pro 5. The device is designed to detect generalized convulsive seizures (GCS) and alert caregivers in real time. Participants will wear the smartwatch continuously and use a home-based autonomous camera for nocturnal video monitoring.

Anticipated Adverse Device Effects and Residual Risks

Given the non-invasive nature of the device, anticipated adverse effects are minimal and primarily related to:

- Skin irritation or discomfort due to prolonged wear of the smartwatch.
- False alarms, which may cause unnecessary caregiver interventions or anxiety.
- Missed detections, potentially leading to delayed caregiver response.

Residual risks include:

- Technical malfunction of the smartwatch or software, resulting in data loss or failure to detect seizures.
- Battery failure or insufficient charging, leading to interrupted monitoring.
- Privacy concerns related to video recordings, although all data is stored locally and patients may disable recording at any time.

No invasive procedures are involved, and the device does not interfere with standard medical treatments.

Risks from Concomitant Treatments and Interactions

Participants will continue their usual anti-seizure medication (ASM) regimens. No interactions between the EpiSave system and concomitant treatments are expected. The device does not deliver therapy or modify treatment plans.

Risks Associated with Participation

Participation involves wearing a smartwatch and installing a camera for nocturnal monitoring. Risks include:

- Discomfort or inconvenience from wearing the device.
- Potential psychological stress due to awareness of seizure monitoring and alerts.
- False reassurance or over-reliance on the device for seizure detection.

There is no withholding of proven therapies, and no diagnostic decisions are made based on the device output.

Anticipated Clinical Benefit

The anticipated benefit is improved detection of nocturnal GCS, enabling timely caregiver intervention and potentially reducing SUDEP risk. The study also aims to validate the device's performance in real-world settings, contributing to future improvements in seizure detection technologies.

Risk-Benefit Rationale

The expected benefits—enhanced seizure detection, improved caregiver response, and contribution to SUDEP prevention—outweigh the minimal risks associated with device wear and monitoring. The study may also benefit future patients by informing the development of more accurate, accessible, and user-friendly seizure detection tools.

Risk Mitigation Measures

- Device training for participants and caregivers.
- Regular follow-up to assess usability and adverse events.
- Option to disable video recording to protect privacy.
- Technical support and device replacement in case of malfunction.
- Secure data handling and encryption protocols.

A formal risk analysis report will be prepared in accordance with ISO 14971 and submitted as part of the regulatory documentation.

Post-Investigation Care

Participants may continue using the device after the study if they wish. Any adverse events will be followed until resolution. Data collected during the study will be securely stored and used in coded form for analysis.

3.8 Justification of the choice of the investigation population

The investigation population consists of people with epilepsy (PWE) aged 6 years and older who have experienced at least two nocturnal generalized convulsive seizures (GCS) per year. This population is specifically targeted because nocturnal GCS are strongly associated with increased risk of SUDEP, and timely detection and intervention during these events may reduce that risk.

Rationale for Selection

The study aims to validate the performance of the EpiSave seizure detection system in real-world ambulatory settings, focusing on nocturnal GCS. Including individuals with a history of nocturnal GCS ensures that the study population is representative of those most likely to benefit from seizure detection technologies. The inclusion of participants from age 6 upwards allows evaluation across both paediatric and adult populations, reflecting the broad applicability of the device.

Representativeness and Scientific Relevance

The selected population is representative of the broader group of PWE at risk of SUDEP, particularly those with drug-resistant epilepsy and frequent nocturnal seizures. The inclusion criteria ensure that participants are likely to experience seizures during the study period, enabling meaningful evaluation of device sensitivity and false alarm rates.

Sex and Gender Considerations

Recruitment will be conducted across multiple epilepsy centres in Switzerland and Europe, using standard clinical pathways and outpatient visits. No exclusion criteria based on sex or gender are applied. The study design allows for balanced recruitment across genders, and any observed sex or gender differences in seizure patterns or device performance will be analysed and reported in accordance with the recommendations of swissethics on equitable research.

Inclusion of Vulnerable Subjects

The study includes minors aged 6–17 years, who are considered vulnerable participants. Their inclusion is justified by the fact that children and adolescents with epilepsy are at high risk of SUDEP and may not be able to alert caregivers during seizures. Excluding this group would prevent the evaluation of the device in a population with critical clinical needs.

Informed consent will be obtained from legal guardians, and assent will be sought from the child when appropriate. Additional safeguards, including simplified consent materials and caregiver involvement,

will be implemented to ensure ethical participation.

3.9 Patient and public involvement

A dedicated PPI panel, including representatives from organizations such as EpiSuisse, dravetsuisse, and ERN EpiCare, would be invited to contribute to the design and implementation of the study.

Their involvement would focus on:

- Providing input on the study procedures, particularly regarding the use of home-based video monitoring and the acceptability of the intervention from the patient and caregiver perspective.
- Advising on communication materials, including patient information sheets and consent forms, to ensure clarity and relevance.
- Participating in the interpretation of study findings, especially in relation to usability, false alarm burden, and caregiver response times.

The PPI panel would also be invited to attend consortium meetings to offer feedback on study progress and help shape future directions. This approach is intended to ensure that the study reflects the needs and priorities of people with epilepsy and their families.

4 CLINICAL INVESTIGATION OBJECTIVES

4.1 Overall Objective

To assess the real-world performance of the EpiSave seizure detection system in detecting GCS in ambulatory patients with epilepsy, with particular focus on nocturnal GCS detection for SUDEP prevention.

4.2 Primary Objective

The primary objective is to assess EpiSave sensitivity for video-confirmed nocturnal GCS detection in real-world ambulatory settings.

4.3 Secondary Objectives

Secondary objectives are:

1. **Daytime and nighttime GCS detection:** To evaluate the system's performance in detecting GCS during different time periods
2. **False Alarm Rate (FAR):** To assess the system's false alarm rate in ambulatory settings
3. **Caregiver response:** To evaluate delays between GCS onset, detection, and caregiver intervention
4. **Seizure duration precision:** To assess the precision of GCS and post-ictal immobility duration calculations
5. **Device usability:** To evaluate device usability scores and adverse events
6. **Quality of Life Impact:** To assess changes in QOLIE-31 scores (Quality Of Life in Epilepsy Inventory)
7. **Technical performance:** To evaluate system reliability and technical performance

4.4 Safety Objectives

To assess the tolerability and safety of the EpiSave system in real-world ambulatory settings, including device-related adverse events, psychological impact, and system reliability.

CLINICAL INVESTIGATION OUTCOMES

5.1 Primary Outcome

The primary outcome is the EpiSave sensitivity for video-confirmed nocturnal GCS detection. It is the proportion of true nocturnal GCS detected by EpiSave out of total verified nocturnal GCS. The validation method will rely on home video recordings captured using an autonomous camera system. Sensitivity will be calculated as part of the statistical analysis, with results presented alongside 95% confidence intervals. The target performance for the system is set at a minimum sensitivity of 90%.

5.2 Secondary Outcomes

The secondary outcomes are presented in the table below:

Secondary outcomes	Definition	Validation method	Target
False alarm rate	Number of false alarms per patient per day	Patient/caregiver feedback through app interface	<1 false alarm per week
Caregiver response time	Time from GCS onset to caregiver intervention	Automatically logged response times	≤5 minutes for 90% of alerts
Seizure duration precision	Accuracy of GCS and post-ictal immobility duration calculations	Comparison with video recordings	±10% accuracy
Device usability score	Standardized usability assessment	SUS questionnaire and custom EpiSave questionnaire	t: ≥4.0/5.0 satisfaction score
Quality of life impact	Change in QOLIE-31 scores	Baseline and 6-month follow-up	Clinically meaningful improvement

5.3 Other Outcomes of Interest

- **System Uptime:** ≥95% over study duration
- **Battery Performance:** Daily charging requirements
- **Environmental Robustness:** Performance across different activities

5.4 Safety Outcomes

- **Adverse Events:** Device-related and procedure-related events
- **Serious Adverse Events:** Life-threatening or hospitalization events
- **Device Deficiencies:** Technical malfunctions affecting safety
- **Biocompatibility Issues:** Skin reactions or allergic response

6 CLINICAL INVESTIGATION DESIGN

6.1 General clinical investigation design and justification of design

Study Type: Prospective, interventional, multi-center, event-driven clinical investigation
Study Design: Single-arm, open-label study

Study Setting: Outpatient/ambulatory settings with patient homes as primary location
Study Duration: 6 months per participant, up to 24 months total recruitment period

Justification: Event-driven design ensures adequate statistical power while allowing for real-world variability in seizure frequency. Single-arm design is appropriate for medical device validation studies where historical controls provide sufficient comparison data.

Design and Rationale

This study is a prospective, open-label, non-randomized, exploratory clinical investigation designed to assess the performance of the EpiSave seizure detection system in ambulatory PWE. The study aims to evaluate the sensitivity and false alarm rate (FAR) of EpiSave for detecting nocturnal GCS in real-world home environments.

This design is justified by the need to validate the device under naturalistic conditions, where seizure detection is most clinically relevant for SUDEP prevention. The study does not include a comparator group, as its primary objective is to assess device performance against video-confirmed seizure events.

Type and Framework

- Type: Open-label, non-randomized
- Framework: Exploratory
- Allocation ratio: Not applicable (no group allocation)
- Blinding: None (open-label); both participants and investigators are aware of the intervention
- Comparator: None; performance is assessed against video-confirmed events

Intervention Studied

- Medical Device: EpiSave v2.0 running on TicWatch Pro 5 smartwatch
- Procedures: Participants wear the smartwatch for ~22 hours/day (with 2 hours for charging). A TP-Link autonomous camera is installed for nocturnal video monitoring to establish ground truth for seizure detection. Participants and caregivers are instructed to review and report detected and missed events during follow-up visits.

Population and Sample Size

- Population: PWE aged ≥ 6 years with ≥ 2 nocturnal GCS per year
- Sample Size: Event-driven; recruitment continues until ≥ 75 nocturnal GCS are recorded in ≥ 50 different participants
- Estimated recruitment: 77–100 participants over 24 months

Assignment Method

- No randomization or stratification is used. All participants receive the same intervention.

Duration and Sequence of Participation

- **Individual participation:** 6 months
- **Sequence:**
 1. Screening and enrolment
 2. Device setup and training
 3. Continuous monitoring for 6 months
 4. Follow-up visits for data review and usability assessment

Participants may continue using EpiSave after the study if they wish.

Limitations and Considerations

- Open-label design may introduce reporting bias, although objective video confirmation mitigates this risk.
- No control group limits comparative conclusions but is appropriate for performance validation.
- False alarms and missed detections may affect caregiver trust and device usability; these will be systematically recorded and analysed.
- Privacy concerns related to video monitoring are addressed by local data storage and the option to disable recording.

6.2 Methods for minimising bias

6.2.1 Randomisation

Not Applicable: Single-arm study design

6.2.2 Blinding procedures

Open-label Design: Participants and investigators are aware of device assignment

Video Analysis: Blinded analysis of video recordings for seizure validation

6.2.3 Other methods for minimising bias

- **Standardized Training:** All participants receive identical device training
- **Objective Measurements:** Automated data collection reduces subjective bias
- **Video Validation:** Independent video analysis for seizure confirmation
- **Statistical Analysis:** Pre-specified analysis plan

6.3 Unblinding Procedures (Code break)

Not Applicable: Open-label study design

7 CLINICAL INVESTIGATION POPULATION

7.1 Eligibility criteria

Subjects fulfilling all of the following inclusion criteria are eligible for the investigation:

1. **Age Requirement:**
 - Age \geq 6 years at the time of enrolment
2. **Epilepsy Diagnosis:**
 - Confirmed diagnosis of epilepsy documented by a board-certified neurologist
 - Diagnosis established through clinical evaluation, EEG findings, and/or neuroimaging as per ILAE diagnostic criteria
3. **Drug-Resistant Epilepsy:**
 - Persisting seizures despite adequate trials of at least two anti-seizure medications (ASMs)
 - Adequate ASM trial defined as: appropriate dose for the specific medication, adequate duration (minimum 3 months), and good compliance
4. **GCS History and Frequency:**
 - Documented history of generalized convulsive seizures (GCS), including:
 - Generalized tonic-clonic seizures (GTCS)
 - Focal to bilateral tonic-clonic seizures (FBTCS)
 - **Minimum seizure frequency:** ≥ 2 GCS during the last 12 months
 - **Nocturnal GCS requirement:** ≥ 2 nocturnal GCS per year
5. **Device Compatibility and Comfort:**
 - Patient must be comfortable wearing wrist-worn devices
 - No known hypersensitivity or skin conditions that would prevent smartwatch wear
 - No physical disabilities that would prevent wearing a wrist-worn device
 - Willingness to wear the device for 22 hours per day (with 2 hours for charging)
6. **Technical Requirements:**
 - Access to a compatible smartphone (Android or iOS devices from 2020 and later)
 - Normal smartphone cellular connectivity for SMS transmission
 - Ability to charge the smartwatch daily
7. **Caregiver Requirements:**
 - Must have a designated caregiver available for monitoring
 - Caregiver must be living with the patient or in close proximity (maximum 10 minutes travel time)
 - Caregiver must be able to respond to alerts within 10 minutes at night
 - Caregiver must be willing and able to operate the EpiSave system
8. **Informed Consent:**
 - Written informed consent from patient or legal representative
 - For participants aged 6-17 years: assent from the participant and consent from legal guardian

The presence of any one of the following exclusion criteria will lead to the exclusion of the subject

1. **Age and Legal Status:**
 - Age $<$ 6 years at the time of enrolment
 - Unable to provide informed consent or assent and no legal representative available
2. **Epilepsy-Related Exclusions:**
 - Uncertain or unconfirmed epilepsy diagnosis
 - Inadequate anti-seizure medication trials (< 2 adequate ASM trials)
 - < 2 GCS during the last 12 months
 - < 2 nocturnal GCS per year
 - No GCS risk during the study period
 - History of non-epileptic psychogenic seizures only
 - Active status epilepticus within the last 3 months
3. **Device and Technical Exclusions:**

- Inability or unwillingness to wear wrist-worn devices
 - Known hypersensitivity to smartwatch materials
 - Skin conditions that would prevent smartwatch wear
 - Physical disabilities that would prevent wearing a wrist-worn device
 - No access to compatible smartphone
 - No cellular connectivity for SMS transmission
 - Inability to charge the smartwatch daily
4. **Caregiver-Related Exclusions:**
- No designated caregiver available for monitoring
 - Caregiver not living with patient or not in close proximity
 - Caregiver unable to respond to alerts within 10 minutes at night
 - Caregiver unwilling or unable to operate the EpiSave system
5. **Medical and Safety Exclusions:**
- Unstable medical condition that would interfere with study participation
 - Active psychiatric illness that would impair study compliance
 - Substance abuse that would interfere with study participation

7.2 Recruitment and screening

Recruitment Strategy:

- EMU patients during monitoring periods
- Outpatient clinic visits
- Referrals from treating neurologists
- Epilepsy support group outreach

Screening Process:

1. **Initial Screening** (Week 0):
 - Review of medical records for epilepsy diagnosis and GCS history
 - Assessment of ASM trial history for drug resistance confirmation
 - Evaluation of seizure frequency over the last 12 months
 - Assessment of device compatibility and caregiver availability
2. **Informed Consent Process** (Week 0):
 - Detailed explanation of study procedures and requirements
 - Review of inclusion/exclusion criteria
 - Discussion of risks and benefits
 - Obtainment of written informed consent
3. **Baseline Assessment** (Week 0):
 - Complete demographic information and medical history
 - Documentation of current ASM regimen
 - Assessment of seizure frequency and characteristics
 - Evaluation of caregiver availability and technical capabilities
 - Participants will be asked to complete the QOLIE-31 (Quality of Life in Epilepsy) questionnaire

7.3 Assignment to investigation groups

Single-arm Study: All eligible participants receive the EpiSave device

7.4 Criteria for withdrawal / discontinuation of subjects

Patients will be withdrawn from this study for the following reasons:

- Withdrawal of informed consent
- Lack of compliance
- Upon patient request at any time
- Changes in health condition leading to the appearance of an exclusion criterion
- Device intolerance or adverse reactions

In case of withdrawal from the study, coded data of withdrawn patient will remain for analysis. The data collected until withdrawal (eCRF, device and app) will be used in a coded manner to avoid compromising the scientific validity of the study. Patient's care and medical follow-up will not be affected in case of

withdrawal.

8 CLINICAL INVESTIGATION INTERVENTION

8.1 Identity of the medical device under investigation

8.1.1 Experimental Intervention (medical device)

Device: EpiSave smartwatch application with proprietary GCS detection algorithm

Hardware Platform:

- **Smartwatch:** TicWatch Pro 5 (Android Wear OS 2.0+)
- **Specifications:** 3D accelerometer (50Hz), gyroscope (50Hz), PPG sensor, SpO2 sensor, GPS, Bluetooth 4.0+, 24-hour battery life, IP67 water resistance

Software Components:

- **Core Application:** EpiSave v2.0 (investigational version)
- **Algorithm:** Proprietary machine learning algorithm for GCS detection
- **Data Collection:** Continuous 24/7 monitoring with 15-minute post-seizure recording
- **Alert System:** Dual-alert to patient and caregiver via SMS with location

Mode of Action:

- Continuous monitoring of motion data via smartwatch 3D-accelerometry sensor
- Real-time analysis using proprietary GCS detection algorithm
- Upon seizure detection: collection of additional biosignals for 15 minutes post-seizure
- Automated dual-alert system to patient and caregiver

8.1.2 Control Intervention (standard/routine/comparator)

No Active Control: Single-arm study design

Historical Controls: Comparison with published performance metrics from current certified devices

8.1.3 Labelling and Supply (re-supply)

Device Labeling: Investigational device labeling compliant with regulatory requirements

Supply Management: Centralized device distribution and tracking system

Re-supply: Devices replaced as needed for technical issues

8.1.4 Storage Conditions

Storage: Room temperature (15-25°C), dry conditions

Handling: Standard medical device handling procedures

8.2 Discontinuation or modifications of the intervention

Discontinuation Criteria:

- Withdrawal of informed consent
- Lack of compliance
- Upon patient request at any time
- Changes in health condition leading to the appearance of an exclusion criterion
- Device intolerance or adverse reactions
- Device malfunction
- Study termination

Modification Procedures: Any device modifications require protocol amendment

8.3 Compliance with clinical investigation intervention

Compliance Monitoring:

- Device wear time tracking (target: 22 hours/day)
- Data transmission monitoring
- Caregiver response tracking
- Monthly compliance assessments

8.4 Data Collection and Follow-up for withdrawn subjects

If a participant withdraws from the study, the reason(s) for withdrawal will be documented when provided. In accordance with Art. 3 Abs. b ClinO-MD, any data and material already collected prior to withdrawal will be evaluated as far as possible.

If the smartwatch contains data at the time of withdrawal and is returned to the study team, these data will be downloaded and included in the analysis. After evaluation, the data will be retained in coded form.

In cases where withdrawal is due to issues related to the safety or performance of the medical device (i.e., the smartwatch), such as skin irritation or discomfort, the principal investigator will request permission from the participant to follow their condition outside the scope of the study. However, given the nature of the device (a wrist-worn smartwatch), the risk is minimal and limited primarily to potential skin reactions.

8.5 Clinical investigation specific preventive measures

NA

8.6 Concomitant Interventions (treatments)

Allowed: Standard anti-seizure medications and routine medical care

Restricted: Other seizure detection devices during study participation

8.7 Medical Device Accountability

Device Tracking: Centralized tracking system for all devices

Accountability: Regular inventory checks and device status monitoring

8.8 Return, Analysis or Destruction of the Medical Device

At the end of participation, the smartwatch worn by the subject will be returned to the investigational site. Any remaining data stored on the device will be downloaded and automatically deleted from the smartwatch during the data transfer process. The device will then be prepared according to the site's standard operating procedures and reassigned to a new participant.

If the smartwatch is no longer functional or suitable for reuse (e.g., due to technical failure or physical damage), it will be returned to the coordinating centre for secure disposal.

9. CLINICAL INVESTIGATION ASSESSMENTS

9.1 Clinical investigation flow chart(s) / table of clinical investigation procedures and assessments

Please see Table 1, Schedule of Assessment, (page 14).

9.2 Assessments of outcomes

9.2.1 Assessment of primary outcome

Variable: Sensitivity of EpiSave for video-confirmed nocturnal GCS.

Method: Sensitivity will be calculated as the proportion of true nocturnal GCS detected by EpiSave out of all video-confirmed nocturnal GCS. Ground truth will be established using autonomous TP-Link cameras installed in participants' bedrooms. Video recordings will be reviewed by trained clinicians to confirm seizure events.

Quality Assurance: All assessors will be trained in standardized video review protocols.

9.2.2 Assessment of secondary outcomes

1. False Alarm Rate (FAR)

- **Variable:** Number of false alarms per patient per day.
- **Method:** False alarms will be reported by patients or caregivers via the EpiSave app interface. Events will be reviewed during follow-up visits.
- **Quality Assurance:** Caregivers will receive training on how to report and annotate events. App logs will be cross-checked with video data when available.

2. Caregiver Response Time

- **Variable:** Time from GCS onset to caregiver intervention.
- **Method:** Automatically logged via the EpiSave app when caregivers respond to alerts. For video-confirmed events, timestamps will be extracted from recordings.
- **Quality Assurance:** App timestamps will be synchronized with video data. Caregivers will be instructed to confirm interventions via the app.

3. Seizure Duration Precision

- **Variable:** Accuracy of EpiSave's calculation of GCS and post-ictal immobility duration.
- **Method:** Comparison between EpiSave-calculated durations and durations measured from video recordings.
- **Quality Assurance:** Video reviewers will use standardized annotation tools. Discrepancies >10% will be flagged for review.

4. Device Usability Score

- **Variable:** User satisfaction and usability.
- **Method:** Standardized System Usability Scale (SUS) and a custom EpiSave questionnaire administered at study end.
- **Quality Assurance:** Questionnaires will be administered electronically with built-in validation checks.

5. Quality of Life Impact

- **Variable:** Change in QOLIE-31 scores.
- **Method:** Participants will complete the QOLIE-31 questionnaire at baseline and after 6 months.
- **Quality Assurance:** Questionnaires will be administered in the participant's preferred language. Missing data will be tracked and minimized through reminders.

9.2.3 Assessment of other outcomes of interest

- **System Uptime:** Automatically logged via the app backend.
- **Battery Performance:** Daily charging logs collected via the app.
- **Environmental Robustness:** Performance across different activity contexts will be assessed using metadata (e.g., time of day, movement patterns).

9.2.4 Assessment of safety outcomes

- **Adverse Events (AEs)** and **Serious Adverse Events (SAEs)** will be collected at each follow-up visit and reported according to protocol.
- **Device Deficiencies** and **Biocompatibility Issues** will be tracked via app logs and participant feedback.

9.2.4.1 Adverse events

All adverse events (AEs) occurring during the investigation will be documented and assessed according to standard clinical research procedures. The following information will be collected for each AE:

- **Time of onset**
- **Duration**
- **Resolution status**
- **Actions taken**
- **Assessment of intensity (mild, moderate, severe)**
- **Relationship to the medical device (smartwatch)**
- **Relationship to study procedures**
- **Expectedness**
- **Seriousness**

Given the nature of the medical device (a wrist-worn smartwatch), the risk of adverse events is minimal. Potential AEs may include, but are not limited to, skin irritation, discomfort due to prolonged wear, or technical issues with the device.

At each scheduled study visit, the investigator will actively ask the participant (and/or caregiver) about any adverse events since the last contact. In addition, participants and caregivers will be encouraged to report any spontaneous adverse events at any time during the study period.

In case of device-related adverse events or deficiencies (e.g., malfunction, usability issues, or inadequate labelling), the device will be returned to the sponsor for analysis, as per section 8.8.

9.2.4.2 Laboratory parameters

NA

9.2.4.3 Vital signs

NA

9.2.5 Assessments in subjects who prematurely stop the clinical investigation

If a participant withdraws from the investigation prematurely, a final follow-up will be conducted either in person at the investigational site (when returning the smartwatch) or remotely via telephone if the device is returned by mail. During this final contact, the investigator will:

- Ask about any adverse events (including skin reactions or discomfort related to the smartwatch)
- Document the time of onset, duration, resolution, and seriousness of any reported events
- Assess the relationship of the event to the medical device and study procedures
- Record any actions taken and the expectedness of the event

In cases where withdrawal is due to issues potentially related to the safety or performance of the smartwatch (e.g., skin irritation), the investigator will request permission from the participant to follow their condition outside the scope of the investigation. The follow-up period in such cases will be up to 30 days post-withdrawal, unless medically indicated otherwise.

All data collected prior to withdrawal will be included in the analysis and retained in coded form after evaluation. No further data will be collected after withdrawal unless the participant consents to follow-up for safety-related reasons.

9.2.6 Follow-up of the subjects after the regular termination of the clinical investigation

Study Completion: Final assessment at 6 months

Optional Continuation: Participants may continue using device post-study

9.3 Procedures at each visit

9.3.1 Screening and Baseline Visit (Week 0)

- Medical history review
- Eligibility assessment
- Informed consent process
- Baseline data collection
- Smartwatch and smartphone setup
- Patient and caregiver training
- System validation and testing
- Confirmation of alert system functionality

9.3.2 Monthly Follow-up Visits (Weeks 4, 8, 12, 16, 20)

- Compliance assessment
- Adverse event review
- Device performance evaluation
- Data collection verification

9.3.3 End-of-study Visit (Week 24)

Return of the smartwatch

- Either in person at the hospital or by postal mail.

Download and deletion of data

- Remaining data on the smartwatch are downloaded.
- Data are automatically deleted from the device after transfer.

Assessment of adverse events

Completion of study questionnaires

- SUS (System Usability Scale) questionnaire
- Custom EpiSave questionnaire
- QOLIE-31 (Quality of Life in Epilepsy)

10. SAFETY → TO BE COMPLETED WITH THE LOCAL CTU

10.1 Definition and Assessment of (Serious) Adverse Events and other safety related events

Adverse Event (AE) (Art. 2 Abs 57 MDR)

Any untoward medical occurrence, unintended disease or injury or any untoward clinical signs (including an abnormal laboratory finding) in subjects, users or other persons whether or not related to the MD.

This includes events related to the MD under investigation or the comparator and to the procedures involved. For users or other persons this is restricted to events related to the MD.

Serious Adverse Event (SAE) (Art. 2 Abs 58 MDR)

Any adverse event that led to any of the following:

- (a) death,
- (b) serious deterioration in the health of the subject that resulted in any of the following:
 - (i) life-threatening illness or injury,
 - (ii) permanent impairment of a body structure or a body function,
 - (iii) hospitalisation or prolongation of patient hospitalisation,
 - (iv) medical or surgical intervention to prevent life-threatening illness or injury or permanent impairment to a body structure or a body function,
 - (v) chronic disease,
- (c) foetal distress, foetal death or a congenital physical or mental impairment or birth defect.

Note: planned hospitalization for pre-existing condition, or a procedure required by the CIP, without a serious deterioration of the health status of the subject, is not considered an SAE

Device deficiency (Art. 2 Abs 59 MDR)

Inadequacy of a medical device related to its identity, quality, durability, reliability, safety or performance, of an investigational device, including malfunction, user errors and inadequate information supplied by the manufacturer.

The definition includes deficiencies related to the investigational MD or the comparator MD.

Malfunction (ISO14155)

Failure of an investigational device to perform in accordance with its intended purpose when used in accordance with the instructions for use or the CIP.

Device deficiency with Serious Adverse Event (SAE) potential (Art. 80 Abs 1 letter c MDR; ISO14155)

Any device deficiency that might have led to a serious adverse event if appropriate action had not been taken, intervention had not occurred, or circumstances had been less fortunate.

Adverse Device Effect (ADE) (ISO14155)

Adverse event possibly, probably or causally related to the use of an investigational device or procedures.

This includes any adverse event resulting from insufficient or inadequate instructions for use, deployment, implantation, installation, operation, or any malfunction of the MD under investigation. This includes any event that is a result of a use error or intentional misuse.

Serious Adverse Device Effect (SADE) (ISO14155)

Adverse device effect (ADE) that has resulted in any of the consequences characteristic of a serious adverse event.

Unanticipated Serious Adverse Device Effect (USADE) (ISO14155)

Serious adverse device effect (SADE) which by its nature, incidence, severity or outcome has not been identified in the current version of the risk analysis report.

Note: Anticipated SADE (ASADE) is an effect which by its nature, incidence, severity or outcome has been previously identified in the risk analysis report.

Causal Relationship of SAE (MDCG 2020-10/1)

A causal relationship towards the medical device or the procedure of the investigation should be rated by the PI and the Sponsor as follows:

- **Not related:** The relationship to the device or procedures can be excluded.
- **Possible:** The relationship with the use of the investigational device is weak but cannot be ruled out completely. Alternative causes are also possible. Cases where relatedness cannot be assessed or no information has been obtained should also be classified as possible.
- **Probable:** The relationship with the use of the investigational device seems relevant and/or the event cannot reasonably be explained by another cause.
- **Causal relationship:** The serious event is associated with the investigational device or with procedures beyond reasonable doubt.

10.2 Adverse events categorization

The adverse events are categorized by the PI and the Sponsor using the following algorithm:

Does the AE meet the seriousness criteria?

- No, it is not serious
 - Is the relationship to the device or the procedure possible, probable or causal?
 - No: non-related AE
 - Yes: ADE
- Yes, it is serious: SAE
 - Is the relationship to the device or the procedure possible, probable or causal?
 - No: non-related SAE
 - Yes: SADE
- Is it anticipated (within expected type, severity and frequency of the complications)?
 - No: unanticipated SADE (USADE)
 - Yes: anticipated SADE (ASADE)

10.3 Documentation and reporting in Medical Device Category C clinical investigations

Important note concerning all following sections of this chapter: add, respectively adapt to other local requirements in case of international investigations.

10.3.1 Foreseeable adverse events and anticipated adverse device effects

List here foreseeable AE and anticipated adverse device effects, together with their likely incidence, mitigation or treatment. The SAEs and adverse device effects, together with their likely incidence, can be presented in a tabular form.

10.3.2 Documentation of device deficiencies and adverse events by the investigator

All **device deficiencies (DD)**, all **serious adverse events (SAE)** and *choose the applicable* **all non-serious adverse events (AE)** *or non-serious adverse events (AE)* identified in this CIP as being critical to the evaluation of the results of the investigation *(please phrase the compliance statement in the Synopsis accordingly)* are collected, fully investigated and documented in the source document and

appropriate CRF during the entire investigation period, i.e. from patient's informed consent until the last CIP-specific procedure, including a safety follow-up period.

- Documentation of AEs (including SAEs) by the PI includes diagnosis or symptoms, start and stop dates of event, event treatment, event resolution, assessment of seriousness and causal relationship to MD and/or investigation procedure (ISO14155 *[please indicate version/year]*).
- Documentation of DDs by the PI includes description of event, start date, investigational device information, action taken with regard to the investigational device, and whether the DD led to an AE (ISO14155 *[please indicate version/year]*).

Specify here how the information on AEs is systematically collected (e.g., by clinical safety assessment and/or safety lab at the regular visits, as applicable and clinically justified in the context of the specific CIP). Also specify here the follow-up period, if applicable (also in case of premature withdrawal of the subject from the investigation). If no such safety follow-up is needed, please specify and justify.

*In case that AEs identified as being critical to this evaluation and not **all** AEs shall be recorded as defined above, please include a list of the AEs evaluated as being critical and that shall be recorded. Please note that in this case full compliance with ISO 14155:2020 **cannot** be claimed.*

10.3.3 Reporting of (Serious) Adverse Events, device deficiencies, and other safety related events

Describe how, by whom and in what time frame the serious and other reportable AE (health hazards, laboratory abnormalities, pregnancies if applicable, etc.) are reported. Note: The Sponsor is responsible for the notifications to CA and to the CECs. The sponsor may delegate the task, but not the responsibility. Describe the reporting responsibilities of the PI to the Sponsor in case of a multicentre investigation, when the Sponsor and the PI are not the same person. Similarly, define the reporting roles and responsibilities to the manufacturer when the Sponsor and the PI are the same person. Describe if there are exceptions for the reporting.

Reporting to the Sponsor:

The following events are to be reported to the Sponsor by the PI (or authorized designee) *within 24 hours and 3 days (give reporting deadlines as applicable. These depend of stage of development and severity of possible consequences. Refer to the European guidance document MDCG 2020-10/1 for details)* after becoming aware of the event:

- All SAEs
- Health hazards that require measures
- DDs with SAE potential
- Other AEs and DDs identified in this CIP as being critical to the evaluation of the results of the investigation

The Sponsor shall define the timelines for reporting of non-serious AEs and DDs to the Sponsor.

The sponsor shall review the investigator's assessment of adverse events and determine and document in writing the seriousness and relationship to the investigational device and procedures required by the CIP (ISO 14155). The Sponsor shall evaluate AEs and SAEs with regard to causality and seriousness. Device deficiencies are also assessed regarding their potential to lead to an SAE (DD with SAE potential) (Art 32. ClinO-MD, ISO 14155).

Pregnancies

Note: Depending of the investigation, reporting of pregnancies may not be necessary.

If reporting is needed, include in the CIP how pregnancies will be reported (usually within 24 hours to the Sponsor), and how occurrence of pregnancy will be handled in the investigation (patient is withdrawn, outcome of the pregnancy should be followed-up, etc). If it is suspected that the MD may have interfered with the effectiveness of a contraceptive medication/device, specify how this should be reported. Details can depend on the type of investigation and intervention.

Reporting to the Competent Ethics Committee and to Swissmedic:

The following events are to be reported to the CEC and to the CA promptly (Art. 33 ClinO-MD):

- a. any serious adverse event that has a causal relationship with the MD to be investigated, the comparator or the investigation procedure, or where such causal relationship is reasonably

- possible;
- b. any device deficiency that might have led to a SAE if appropriate action had not been taken, intervention had not occurred, or circumstances had been less fortunate; (DD with SADE potential);
- c. any new findings in relation to any event referred to in points (a) and (b).

In order to ensure prompt notification, the Sponsor may initially submit an incomplete notification.

In line with European guidance document MDCG 2020-10/1 Rev. 1, reportable SAE and DD must be sent to Swissmedic within 7 days, or 2 days for SAE requiring prompt action for the safety of other study subjects.

If applicable: For conformity-related clinical trials in sub-categories C1 and C2 that are also being conducted abroad: The sponsor notifies the CEC and CA without delay of all events, device deficiencies and findings as specified above which arise from the conduct of the clinical trial abroad.

If safety and health hazards that require measures must be taken immediately during the conduct of the investigation, the Sponsor notifies the CEC and CA within 2 days of these measures and the circumstances which made them necessary (Art. 34 ClinO-MD).

If applicable: For clinical trials that are also being conducted or are also due to be conducted in EU or EEA states, The Sponsor notifies the CEC and CA within 2 days of all imposed or voluntary safety and protective measures that are being implemented in EU or EEA states and the circumstances that necessitated them (Art. 34 ClinO-MD).

Periodic safety reporting (Art. 35 ClinO-MD):

Once a year, the sponsor submits to the CEC and CA a list of all SAEs and DDs and provides it with a report on their severity, causal relationship with the device and/or the intervention and on the safety of the participants (outcome, event status). The sponsor informs the CEC and CA annually about the general progress and status of recruitment of the clinical investigation (*also abroad*). Any safety-relevant measures taken by the sponsor or imposed by ethics committees *or authorities anywhere in the world as well as results from other clinical investigations with the investigational device (if applicable)* shall be described. Based on the data presented in the report, the sponsor will draw his/her conclusions regarding the safety of the subjects and the continuation of the investigation. *The safety report and the general progress report can be merged in one single report.*

The cumulative list of reportable serious adverse events and device deficiencies (MDCG 2020-10/2 Rev. 1) per cut-off date is submitted in parallel.

10.3.4 Follow-up of (Serious) Adverse Events

Describe the follow-up of subjects terminating the investigation (either regularly or prematurely) with reported ongoing SAE, or any ongoing AEs of laboratory values or of vital signs. Describe how and what is done to follow-up on ongoing SAE and AES, and what is documented. Describe efforts taken in case of loss to follow-up.

10.4 Documentation and reporting in Medical Device Category A clinical investigations

Important note concerning all following sections of this chapter: add, respectively adapt to other local requirements in case of international investigations.

Device deficiencies (DD) and all **adverse events (AE)** including all **serious adverse events (SAE)** are collected, fully investigated and documented in the source document and appropriate case report form (CRF) during the entire investigation period, i.e. from patient's informed consent until the last CIP-specific procedure, including a safety follow-up period.

- Documentation of AEs (including SAEs) by the PI includes diagnosis or symptoms, start and stop dates of event, event treatment, event resolution, assessment of seriousness and causal relationship to MD and/or investigation procedure (Art. 32 ClinO-MD, ISO14155).
- Documentation of DDs by the PI includes description of event, start date, investigational device information, action taken with regard to the investigational device, and whether the DD led to an AE. The Sponsor shall review all DDs and determine and document in writing whether they could have led to a SAE (DD with SADE potential) (Art 32. ClinO-MD, ISO14155).

Specify here how the information on AEs is systematically collected (e.g., by clinical safety assessment

at the regular visits, as applicable and clinically justified in the context of the specific CIP). Also specify here the follow-up period, if applicable (also in case of premature withdrawal of the subject). If no such safety follow-up is needed, please specify and justify.

10.4.1 Foreseeable adverse events and anticipated adverse device effects

List here foreseeable serious adverse events and anticipated adverse device effects, together with their likely incidence, mitigation or treatment. The serious adverse events and adverse device effects, together with their likely incidence, can be presented in a tabular form.

10.4.2 Reporting of Safety related events

Reporting to the Sponsor:

All SAEs, DDs with SAE potential and health hazards that require measures are reported to the Sponsor by the PI (or authorized designee) without delay after becoming aware of the event. DD are assessed regarding their potential to lead to an SAE.

Pregnancies

Depending of the investigation, reporting of pregnancies may not be necessary. If reporting is needed, include in the CIP how pregnancies will be reported (usually within a maximum of 24 hours to the Sponsor), and how occurrence of pregnancy will be handled in the investigation (patient is withdrawn, outcome of the pregnancy should be followed-up, etc.). Details can depend on the type of investigation and intervention.

Reporting to the Competent Ethics Committee:

The Sponsor reports to the CEC without delay any SAE for which a causal relationship between the event and the test procedure used in the clinical trial has been ascertained (Art. 33 ClinO-MD).

In order to ensure prompt notification, the Sponsor may initially submit an incomplete notification.

If safety and health hazards that require measures must be taken immediately during the conduct of the investigation, the Sponsor notifies the CEC within 2 days of these measures and the circumstances which made them necessary (Art. 34 ClinO-MD).

If applicable: For clinical trials that are also being conducted or are also due to be conducted in EU or EEA states, the sponsor notifies the CEC within two days of all imposed or voluntary safety and protective measures that are being implemented in EU or EEA states and the circumstances that necessitated them (Art. 34 ClinO-MD).

Periodic safety reporting (Art. 35 ClinO-MD):

Once a year, the sponsor submits to the CEC a list of the SAEs and DDs and provides it with a report on their severity, causal relationship with the device and the intervention, as well as on the safety of the participants. The sponsor informs the CEC about the general progress of the clinical investigation, annually. *The safety report and the general progress report can be merged in one single report.*

Materiovigilance reporting to Swissmedic:

The Sponsor is responsible for ensuring that Swissmedic is informed of serious incidents in accordance with Art. 66 MedDO.

Materiovigilance reports are not sent to the CEC.

If the Sponsor is the manufacturer of the investigational device or Swiss representative of the manufacturer:

- *the Sponsor has to send reportable incidents to Swissmedic (materiovigilance@swissmedic.ch) with the form available at www.swissmedic.ch/md-materiovigilance-manufacturers (Art. 66 para. 1 to 2bis MedDO).*

If the Sponsor is not the manufacturer of the investigational device or Swiss representative of the manufacturer:

- *In case of incidents, check whether the event is subject to materiovigilance reporting duties for users acc. to Art. 66, para. 4 MedDO (using guidance MU680_20_008e_WL). If the clinical investigation/performance study is conducted in a hospital, the materiovigilance contact person*

- *of the hospital may also be contacted (Art. 67 para. 2 MedDO)*
- *The Sponsor has to ensure that reportable incidents are sent to Swissmedic with the form MU680_20_015d_FO (materiovigilance@swissmedic.ch). Guidance and forms are available at www.swissmedic.ch/md-materiovigilance-users.*
- *Users are legally obliged to inform the suppliers of the devices about serious incidents (Art. 66, para 4 MedDO).*

10.5 Assessment, notification and reporting on the use of radiation sources

In investigations involving therapeutic or diagnostic products capable of emitting ionising radiation and/or medical exams that use ionizing radiation (X-rays, CT scans, PET scans, fluoroscopy, ...), the Sponsor shall assess compliance with the dose guidance value in accordance with Art. 45 of the Radiological Protection Ordinance of 26 April 2017. The dose guidance values for investigations without expected direct benefit for the subjects is 5 mSv effective dose per year.

If the permitted dose guidance value is exceeded at any time, the Sponsor or the PI notifies the CEC within 7 working days after becoming aware of the event [Art. 39 ClinO-MD].

When applicable, in the case of Category C clinical investigation with MDs that emit ionising radiation:

If in the case of Category C clinical investigations with MDs that emit ionising radiation, if the permitted dose guidance value is exceeded at any time, the Sponsor or the PI notifies the CA within 7 working days after becoming aware of the event [Art. 39 ClinO-MD].

Within one year of the completion or discontinuation of the investigation involving examinations with radioactive sources, the Sponsor sends to the CEC and to the CA a final report containing all information relevant to radiation protection, in particular an estimate of the doses to which the subjects were exposed [Art. 39 ClinO-MD].

11 STATISTICAL METHODS

11.1 Hypothesis

Primary Hypothesis: EpiSave will demonstrate $\geq 90\%$ sensitivity for video-confirmed nocturnal GCS detection in real-world ambulatory settings.

Secondary Hypotheses:

- EpiSave will maintain a false alarm rate of $< 1/\text{week}$ in ambulatory settings
- Caregiver response times will be ≤ 5 minutes for 90% of seizure alerts
- System uptime will be $\geq 95\%$ over the study period
- Patient and caregiver satisfaction scores will be $\geq 4.0/5.0$ on standardized scales

11.2 Determination of Sample Size

Target: Minimum of 75 verified nocturnal GCS in at least 50 PWE

Statistical Rationale:

- **Regulatory Requirement:** Aligns with FDA/CE guidelines for medical device validation studies
- **Literature-Based:** Based on published recommendations for phase 4 seizure detection studies
- **Power Calculation:** Provides 90% power to detect sensitivity $\geq 90\%$ with 95% confidence
- **Event-Driven Design:** Ensures adequate statistical power regardless of recruitment timeline
- **Dropout Consideration:** Accounts for 20% anticipated dropout rate

Recruitment Timeline: 24 months (≤ 1 PWE/4 months/center)

11.3 Statistical criteria of termination of the investigation

Early Termination Criteria:

- Safety concerns identified by DSMC
- Regulatory authority decision
- Insufficient recruitment (after 24 months)
- Study objectives achieved

11.4 Planned Analyses

11.4.1 Datasets to be analysed, analysis populations

Analysis Populations:

- **Per-Protocol (PP):** Participants completing study with protocol compliance
- **Intention-to-Treat (ITT):** All enrolled participants regardless of completion
- **Safety Population:** All participants receiving the device

11.4.2 Primary Analysis

Primary Endpoint Analysis:

- **Sensitivity Calculation:** Proportion of true nocturnal GCS detected by EpiSave
- **Confidence Intervals:** 95% Wilson confidence intervals
- **Statistical Test:** One-sample proportion test against 90% target
- **Analysis Population:** Per-protocol population (all participants with ≥ 1 nocturnal GCS)

11.4.3 Secondary Analyses

False Alarm Rate Analysis:

- **Definition:** False alarms per patient per day
- **Statistical Method:** Negative binomial regression for count data
- **Covariates:** Age, seizure frequency, device wear time
- **Target:** < 1 false alarm per week per patient

Caregiver Response Time Analysis:

- **Definition:** Time from alert to caregiver response
- **Statistical Method:** Kaplan-Meier survival analysis

- **Censoring:** Right-censored at 30 minutes
- **Target:** ≤5 minutes for 90% of alerts

System Reliability Analysis:

- **Definition:** System uptime percentage
- **Statistical Method:** Mixed-effects model for repeated measures
- **Random Effects:** Participant and time
- **Target:** ≥95% uptime over study duration

11.4.4 Interim analyses

Interim Analysis Plan:

- **Timing:** After 25%, 50%, and 75% of target events
- **Primary Focus:** Safety and futility assessment
- **Statistical Method:** O'Brien-Fleming stopping boundaries
- **DSMC Review:** Independent review of interim results

11.4.5 Deviation(s) from the original statistical plan

Protocol Deviations: Any deviations from the statistical plan will be documented and justified

11.5 Handling of missing data and drop-outs

- **Primary Analysis:** Complete case analysis
- **Sensitivity Analysis:** Multiple imputation for missing data
- **Drop-out Analysis:** Comparison of completers vs. drop-outs

Drop-out Management:

- **Prevention:** Regular follow-up and support
- **Documentation:** Reason for drop-out and data completeness
- **Analysis:** Intent-to-treat analysis including all randomized participants

1. 12 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTROL → TO BE COMPLETED WITH THE LOCAL CTU

Describe how quality is assured and controlled. The Sponsor is responsible for implementing and maintaining quality assurance and quality control systems with written SOPs and Working Instructions, at all sites in case of multicentric investigations. Indicate the software used. The PI is responsible for proper training of all involved investigation personnel.

12.1 Data handling and record keeping / archiving

Describe how data are handled and that all investigation related documents are archived. A list of the essential clinical investigation documents which should be maintained in the investigation site and sponsor file is given in ISO14155 Annex E.

12.1.1 Case Report Forms

Describe how the investigation data is recorded, e.g. with paper or electronic Case Report Forms (p-/e-CRF). A CRF is maintained for each enrolled subject. CRFs must be kept current to reflect subject status at each phase during the course of the investigation. Subjects must not be identified in the CRF by name or initials and birth date. Describe the coding used for the investigation, e.g. subject number in combination with year of birth (see the guidance document published on [swissethics.ch](https://www.swissethics.ch) "coding of trial subject accepted by swissethics and secure storage of subject identification list" https://swissethics.ch/assets/Themen/akzeptierte_verschlueselung_e.pdf)

If paper-CRFs are used, describe how data is entered into an electronic database for analysis (e.g., double data entry).

Note: The person(s) authorized by the PI to enter the data in the CRF must be listed on the delegation log.

CRF Design: Electronic case report forms (eCRFs)

Data Elements: All study variables and endpoints

Validation: Built-in validation rules and range checks

Completion: Real-time data entry with immediate validation

12.1.2 Specification of source data and source documents

Source data should be available at the site to document the existence of the investigation subjects. Source data must include the original documents relating to the investigation, as well as the medical treatment and medical history of the subject. In case of electronic source data (e.g. from Apps or from automatic recording devices), describe how the data is handled, transferred, stored and accessed by the PI and authorised staff.

Describe what is considered the source documents in the investigation (specify what is the source document for each data collected in the CRF, e.g., demographic data, visit dates, participation in investigation and ICFs, randomisation codes, SAEs, SADEs, USADEs, and concomitant medication, results of relevant examinations. Identify data that are directly recorded in the CRF, which should also be considered being source data. Also describe where original source data are kept at the site. You can also refer to a separate document in the Appendices ("source data description and source data location").

- Medical records
- Device data logs
- Video recordings
- Patient diaries
- Laboratory reports

Source Data Verification: 100% verification of critical data elements

12.1.3 Archiving of essential clinical investigation documents

All the documents of the investigation must be archived for a minimum of (time according to local legislation) years after regular or premature termination of the investigation.

Describe Sponsor (Art. 40 Abs 1 ClinO-MD) and PI (Art. 40 Abs 2 ClinO-MD) responsibilities. Specify

location and length of storage. Archiving for 10 years, in the case of an implantable device 15 years in Switzerland (Art. 40 ClinO-MD).

12.2 Data management

Describe plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (e.g., double data entry; range checks for data values). In case electronic data capture systems are used, this chapter shall include a description of procedures for verification, validation and securing the database.

If data will not be anonymised after the statistical analysis, describe in which form they will be stored (e.g. coded). If the data is anonymised, describe how this is done

Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the CIP.

12.2.1 Data Management System

Describe what system (including cloud services and software) is being used and who is responsible and how it is tested before the investigation begins (may include a description of where the system is hosted).

System: Electronic data capture (EDC) system

Features: Real-time data entry, validation, and monitoring

Security: Encrypted data transmission and storage

Backup: Daily automated backups

12.2.2 Data security, access and back-up

Describe who has access to data, how, where and when – and which backup systems are in place (if applicable).

- User authentication and authorization
- Encrypted data transmission (AES-256)
- Secure data storage
- Regular security audits

Access Control:

- Role-based access permissions
- Audit trail for all data access
- Regular access reviews

12.2.3 Analysis and archiving

Describe how data are extracted and where they are stored, database status recording, duration and place of storage.

Analysis: Statistical analysis using validated software

Archiving: Long-term storage of all study data and documents

Retention: 15-year retention period as per regulatory requirements

12.2.4 Electronic and central data validation

Describe how data are validated.

- Range checks for all numeric variables
- Consistency checks across related variables
- Completeness checks for required fields
- Cross-validation with source documents

12.3 Monitoring

Describe the regular monitoring visits at the PI's site prior to the start and during the course of the investigation organised by the Sponsor. Give a detailed description of what, which data and documents will be monitored and to which extent (these points are given here as examples only: subject enrolment logs, informed consents and informed consent process, source data verification, inclusion and exclusion criteria, subjects' visit schedule, safety, processing of subjects' data, preservation of subjects confidentiality, reporting to CEC and RA and approvals, provisions of records and data retention, etc...).

Indicate which organisation or person does the monitoring; specify monitor qualification and training. Describe procedure to review the monitoring visit reports, follow-up on monitoring findings and corrective actions.

Alternatively the extent and nature of monitoring activities and all the details described in the above paragraph, based on the objective and design of the investigation, can be written in a Monitoring Plan. The Monitoring Plan must be annexed to the CIP (Annex XV, Chapter 2, Art. 3.6.6. MDR).

Provide a statement that the source data/documents are accessible to monitors and questions are answered during monitoring by the PI and the site staff.

12.4 Audits and Inspections

Describe the frequency and procedures for auditing the investigation, if any, and whether the process will be independent from the PI and the Sponsor. Provide a statement that the documentation of the investigation and the source data/documents are accessible to auditors/inspectors (also CEC and CA) and questions are answered during inspections. All involved parties must keep the subject data strictly confidential.

12.5 Confidentiality, Data Protection

Data protection; should include the statement that direct access to source documents will be permitted for purposes of monitoring (chapter 12.3), audits and inspections (chapter 12.4) and should declare who will have access to the documents of the investigation, dataset, randomization code, etc. during and after the investigation (refer to chapter 13 for publication and dissemination of the results of the investigation).

12.6 Storage of biological material and related health data

In the event the data of the investigation is stored in a data-registry: add here that the coded data of the subjects who consented for the further use of their data (independently of the investigation specific consent) will be stored in a registry for an undetermined length of time, and the data could be re-used for other research projects (provided previous approval by the CEC).

If applicable, describe for how long and where the samples and personal data are stored, or state that samples are destroyed and data anonymised after the end of the storage period. The information provided here must match the information given in chapters 8.4 and 9.2.5.

In the event of Biobank or registry storage, confirm that coded samples and/or data are only stored if the subjects consent for further use has been obtained. This consent is given (or withheld) independently of the participation in the investigation (Art. 17. ClinO).

13. PUBLICATION AND DISSEMINATION POLICY

Give the publication policy of the results of the investigation, if not addressed in a separate agreement, according to Art. 42 ClinO-MD.

Describe plans to communicate the results of the investigation to the subjects, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (e.g., via a summary in lay language, publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements); anticipate for authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers and, if any plans for granting public access to the full CIP, subject-level dataset, and statistical code, including who will have ultimate authority over any of the activities. Mention the protection of trade secrets, if applicable.

Confirm that if “sex and gender” effects are observed, they will be published in the final study report. If an analysis is performed but no “sex and gender” effects are observed, this should also be published in the final study report.

The Sponsor will enter and publish a summary of the results of the clinical investigation in a public recognized register (as specified in Art. 64 Abs. 1 lit a or b ClinO) *(complete the paragraph as appropriate)*:

a) immediately after submitting the final report *(for completed clinical trials with devices that already bear a conformity marking and were used in accordance with the instructions, or in the event of an early termination or interruption of a clinical trial: in accordance with Article 37)*

or b) at the latest before the device is placed on the market or one year after submitting the final report if the device has not been placed on the market by this point in time. *(for all other completed clinical trials, in accordance with Article 37).*

The Sponsor also ensures that a lay summary of the results is entered in BASEC within the period specified in the paragraph above. The entry is made at least in the national languages of Switzerland in which the study participants were recruited.

If publication of the results is not possible within the specified period for scientific reasons, the sponsor will explain this in the application documents and indicate when publication will take place. Adapt this paragraph accordingly.

The investigator will provide each participant with the lay summary of the results of the clinical investigation at the end of the study, directly. *The investigator should ensure that participants are adequately informed about this in the patient information document and also that they are informed where the lay summary of the results of the clinical investigation will be published online.*

14 FUNDING AND SUPPORT

14.1 Funding

Provide brief statement of sources and types of financial support for the investigation. If applicable, reference to other places or contracts/documents where this information is captured.

14.2 Other Support

Provide brief statement of any other type of support received to conduct the investigation (MD, comparator, investigation material, software's, ...). If applicable, reference to other places or contracts/documents where this information is captured.

15 INSURANCE

Give proof of insurance cover or indemnification of subjects in case of injury, pursuant to Art. 3 ClinO-MD. E.g., "Insurance is provided by the Sponsor and fulfils the legal provision of art. 3 ClinO-MD. A copy of the insurance certificate is filed in Investigator's file and in the Sponsor's file."

Note: Category A1 performance studies are exempt from liability coverage requirements (ClinO Art. 12). Categories A2 and C performance studies need to document the guarantee of liability (insurance certificate or equivalent guarantee) (ClinO Art. 13).

The insurance must cover damage occurring up to 20 years after the end of the clinical investigation.

The policy value shall be set in accordance with ClinO Annex 2.

It can be referred here to another place where the document is found, e.g., chapter 17 or elsewhere.

16 REFERENCES

Provide a list of the references pertaining and cited in the CIP.

1. Declaration of Helsinki, Version October 2013 (<http://www.wma.net>)
2. Humanforschungsgesetz, HFG Bundesgesetz über die Forschung am Menschen (Bundesgesetz über die Forschung am Menschen, HFG) vom 30. September 2011/ Loi fédérale relative à la recherche sur l'être humain (loi relative à la recherche sur l'être humain, LRH) du 30 septembre 2011 / Legge federale concernente la ricerca sull'essere umano (Legge sulla ricerca umana, LRUm) del 30 settembre 2011
3. Verordnung über klinische Versuche mit Medizinprodukten (KlinV-Mep) vom 1. Juli 2020 / Ordonnance sur les essais cliniques de dispositifs médicaux (OClin-Dim) du 1er juillet 2020 /. Ordinanza sulle sperimentazioni cliniche con dispositivi medici (OSRUM-Dmed) del 1 luglio 2020
4. Verordnung über klinische Versuche mit Ausnahme klinischer Versuche mit Medizinprodukten (Verordnung über klinische Versuche, KlinV) vom 20. September 2013 / Ordonnance sur les essais cliniques hors essais cliniques de dispositifs médicaux (Ordonnance sur les essais cliniques, OCLin) du 20 septembre 2013. Ordinanza sulle sperimentazioni cliniche ad eccezione delle sperimentazioni cliniche con dispositivi medici (Ordinanza sulle sperimentazioni cliniche, OSRUM) del 20 settembre 2013
5. Medizinprodukteverordnung (MepV) vom 17. Oktober 2001 / Ordonnance sur les dispositifs médicaux (ODim) du 17 octobre 2001 / Ordinanza relativa ai dispositivi medici (ODmed) del 17 ottobre 2001
6. Medical Device Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of 5 April 2017 (MDR)
7. MDCG 2024-3 Guidance on content of the Clinical Investigation Plan for clinical investigations of medical devices
8. MDCG 2020-10/1 Safety reporting in clinical investigations of medical devices under the Regulation (EU) 2017/745 (https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/md_sector/docs/md_mdcg_2020-10-1_guidance_safety_reporting_en.pdf)
9. EN ISO 14155: Clinical investigation of medical devices for human subjects - Good clinical practice (www.iso.org)
10. EN ISO 10993: Biological evaluation of medical devices (www.iso.org)
11. EN ISO 14971: Application of risk management to medical devices (www.iso.org)
12. WHO, International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) (<http://www.who.int/ictrp/en/>)
13. Strahlenschutzverordnung (StSV) vom 26. April 2017 / Ordonnance sur la radioprotection (ORaP) du 26 avril 2017 / Ordinanza sulla radioprotezione (ORaP) del 26 aprile 2017.
14. International Conference on Harmonization (ICH) Guideline for Good Clinical Practice E6(R2), (www.ich.org).
15. Zz
16. Yy

17 APPENDICES

NOTE: Further relevant information can be found in the ISO14155, Annex A Clinical Investigation Plan (CIP)

Documents that do frequently change during the course of the investigation can be mentioned as 'documents provided separately' and listed here.

The section headings can be renamed accordingly.

- 1. Investigator's Brochure*
- 2. General Insurance Conditions, insurance certificate*
- 3. List of norms*
- 4. List of investigational sites / PIs (List of countries or centres where data will be collected)*
- 5. Specific protocols (e.g. MRI)*
- 6. Case Report Form (ISO14155 Annex C)*
- 7. Monitoring Plan*
- 8. Other material handed over to the patients*