

MONITORING VISIT REPORT

VISIT INFORMATION

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Protocol Title: | A Randomized, Open-Label, Multicenter, Phase 3 Trial Comparing Veliparib Plus Carboplatin and Paclitaxel Versus Investigator's Choice of Standard Chemotherapy in Subjects Receiving First Cytotoxic Chemotherapy for Metastatic or Advanced Non-Squamous Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC) and Who Are Current or Former Smokers |
| Protocol Name: | M14-359 |
| Site Name / Site #: | Clearview Cancer Institute / SITE-012 |
| Site Address: | Huntsville, USA |
| Site Activation Date: | 2024-03-09 |
| Monitoring Visit Date: | 2025-06-11 |
| Visit Type: | On-Site |
| CRA: | CRA-001 |

SUMMARY OF MONITORING VISIT

This Remote Monitoring Visit (RMV) was conducted on 11-Jun-2025 to review the ongoing data quality and regulatory compliance at Clearview Cancer Institute (Site SITE-012). With the study enrollment phase complete and 20 subjects having completed the protocol, the site is currently managing 3 ongoing subjects in the maintenance phase. The primary objectives of this visit were to perform remote Source Document Verification (SDV) for recent laboratory data, review the resolution status of previously identified Drug Accountability discrepancies, and verify the training documentation for new site staff. The Principal Investigator, Dr. Reynolds, and Study Coordinator, Ms. Davis, were available for the remote exit interview via teleconference.

While the site has successfully met enrollment targets, this visit identified scattered compliance issues suggesting a systemic difficulty in maintaining data entry quality during the maintenance phase. Specifically, Source Document Verification (SDV) revealed persistent discrepancies in Lab Results data entry for 5 subjects, primarily involving unit transcription errors that have not been corrected despite previous guidance. Additionally, a review of the eRegulatory binder indicated that training records (GCP certificates and Delegation of Authority Log signatures) were missing for two new staff members recently assigned to data entry tasks.

Furthermore, the site is carrying a backlog of 11 open queries across Lab Results, Drug Accountability, and AE Log domains, several of which have been open for >30 days. The Drug Accountability discrepancies noted during the previous visit have only been partially resolved; while one kit variance was explained, a second remains outstanding. The site staff have been instructed to prioritize query resolution and update the ISF with the missing training documents immediately to ensure inspection readiness.

Overall Impression:

The site has met enrollment goals, but data hygiene is deteriorating with multiple open queries and recurrent transcription errors requiring immediate remediation.

Exit Interview Comments:

Dr. Reynolds acknowledged the data entry backlog, attributing it to the recent turnover of the data entry assistant. Ms. Davis committed to dedicating two full days next week to clearing the 11 open queries and correcting the lab unit errors. They agreed to upload the missing training documents for the new staff by 18-Jun-2025.

URGENT ISSUES

Yes

- A. Training records (GCP/DOAL) missing for 2 new staff members performing data entry.
- B. 11 open queries >30 days across multiple domains (Labs, IP, AE).
- C. Systemic data entry errors in Lab Results for 5 subjects.

MONITORING VISIT REPORT

PERSONS PRESENT

| Name | Position/Title |
|--------------|------------------------|
| Dr. Reynolds | Principal Investigator |
| Ms. Davis | Study Coordinator |

ENROLLMENT STATUS

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Screened: | 33 |
| Consented: | 23 |
| Pre Randomization Failure: | 10 |
| Randomized: | 23 |
| Completed: | 20 |
| Ongoing: | 3 |
| Withdrawn: | 0 |

Recruitment Plan Notes:

Enrollment is closed. Site met 82% of original target (23/28) but recruitment is now complete. Focus is on retention of the 3 ongoing subjects.

Recruitment Rate Adequate? Yes

MONITORING VISIT REPORT

MONITORING CHECKLIST

Informed Consent

| | | | |
|---|--|-----|--|
| 1 | Is the current IRB/EC-approved ICF version being used? | Yes | Version 3.0 is current. |
| 2 | Was ICF signed prior to any study procedures? | Yes | Verified for all randomized subjects. |
| 3 | Are all pages of the ICF present and signed/dated correctly? | Yes | |
| 4 | Is re-consent required and has it been performed? | N/A | No new ICF amendments requiring re-consent since last visit. |

Site Staff/Facilities

| | | | |
|----|--|-----|---|
| 5 | Is the Principal Investigator available and involved? | Yes | Dr. Reynolds attended the exit interview. |
| 6 | Are Sub-Investigators qualified and delegated appropriately? | Yes | |
| 7 | Is the Study Coordinator trained and familiar with the protocol? | Yes | Ms. Davis is knowledgeable but struggling with data entry v |
| 8 | Are pharmacy facilities adequate and secure? | Yes | Remote verification of temp logs confirms compliance. |
| 9 | Is the laboratory certified and are normal ranges current? | Yes | CAP/CLIA current. |
| 10 | Is equipment calibrated and maintained? | Yes | Centrifuge calibration logs up to date. |
| 11 | Is the Delegation of Authority Log (DOAL) current? | No | Update DOAL and obtain PI signature. |
| 12 | Is the Training Log complete for all staff? | No | Upload GCP certs to eReg. |
| 13 | Are CVs current and signed for all staff? | Yes | CVs were present, just training logs missing. |

Investigator Site File / Monitoring Activities

| | | | |
|----|---|-----|--|
| 14 | Is the Investigator Site File (ISF) complete and organized? | Yes | eRegulatory binder is generally well maintained aside from |
| 15 | Are essential documents current (FDA 1572, FDF, etc.)? | Yes | |
| 16 | Is the Site Visit Log signed by the monitor? | Yes | Electronic signature applied. |
| 17 | Have actions from prior visits been resolved? | No | Resolve remaining IP discrepancy. |

Research Ethics Board

| | | | |
|----|---|-----|-------------------------------------|
| 18 | Is IRB/EC approval current for protocol and ICF? | Yes | Continuing Review approval on file. |
| 19 | Are protocol amendments approved and implemented? | Yes | |
| 20 | Are safety reports (IND Safety Reports) submitted to IRB? | Yes | Acknowledged via portal. |
| 21 | Is annual renewal/continuing review current? | Yes | Next due date: 15-Feb-2026. |
| 22 | Is site-specific consent approved (if applicable)? | N/A | |
| 23 | Is SAE reporting compliant with IRB requirements? | Yes | |

Safety

| | | | |
|----|---|-----|--|
| 24 | Are Adverse Events (AEs) reported in a timely manner? | Yes | Generally yes, though some start dates required query clar |
| 25 | Are SAEs followed to resolution? | Yes | No open SAEs at this time. |
| 26 | Is pregnancy reporting compliant? | N/A | No pregnancies reported. |
| 27 | Are protocol deviations documented? | Yes | Minor deviations regarding visit windows documented. |
| 28 | Is the safety database reconciled with the CRF? | Yes | |
| 29 | Are SUSAR notifications processed timely? | Yes | |
| 30 | Are DSMB recommendations implemented? | Yes | |
| 31 | Is the risk-benefit assessment current? | Yes | |

Compliance

| | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|-----|--|
| 32 | Is protocol compliance acceptable? | Yes | Acceptable overall, though minor deviations in visit windows |
| 33 | Is GCP compliance maintained? | Yes | Generally yes, but documentation practices regarding data |
| 34 | Is regulatory compliance current? | No | Obtain and file missing training records. |

Study Investigational Product

| | | | |
|----|--|-----|---|
| 35 | Is IP storage adequate and secure? | Yes | Ambient temperature logs reviewed; no excursions. |
| 36 | Is IP accountability current? | No | Reconcile Kit #20991 status. |
| 37 | Is IP dispensing correct per protocol? | Yes | IWRS confirmations match source. |
| 38 | Are IP returns documented? | Yes | Subject returns logged correctly. |
| 39 | Is temperature monitoring compliant? | Yes | |

Study Supplies/Vendors

MONITORING VISIT REPORT

| | | | |
|--|---|-----|---|
| 40 | Are lab kits and supplies adequate? | Yes | Inventory sufficient for remaining 3 subjects. |
| Source Document Verification & Review | | | |
| 41 | Are source documents available? | Yes | EMR access provided remotely. |
| 42 | Is SDV completed per the monitoring plan? | Yes | 100% SDV performed for ongoing subjects. |
| 43 | Are data discrepancies identified? | Yes | Multiple discrepancies in lab units. |
| 44 | Does CRF data match source documents? | No | Correct CRF entries for Subjects 101-019 through 101-023. |
| 45 | Is query resolution timely? | No | Resolve all queries >30 days. |
| 46 | Are data corrections documented? | Yes | Audit trails are visible in EDC. |

MONITORING VISIT REPORT

SOURCE DOCUMENT VERIFICATION & CHART REVIEW

| Subject | Visits Reviewed | Comments | Action Required |
|---------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 101-021 | Cycle 12 | Neutrophil count entered as 2.1 (10^9/L) | Update EDC to match source units. |
| 101-022 | Cycle 10 | Creatinine value missing from EDC; prese | Enter missing data. |
| 101-023 | Cycle 8 | Stop date for Ondansetron incorrect in E | Correct stop date. |
| 101-019 | Cycle 14 | Unit discrepancy in Platelet count. Recu | Correct unit error. |
| 101-020 | Cycle 14 | Unit discrepancy in WBC count. Recurring | Correct unit error. |

FOLLOW-UP FROM PRIOR VISIT

Action: Resolve Drug Accountability discrepancies for Kit #20990 and #20991 | Status: Partially Resolved | Kit #20990 resolved (lost by subject). Kit #20991 still unaccounted for in logs vs EDC.

CRA ASSESSMENT

Site SITE-012 has successfully completed enrollment and is managing the remaining subjects adequately from a clinical perspective. However, administrative compliance and data quality have degraded over the last monitoring interval. The site demonstrates difficulty maintaining consistent data entry quality despite repeated corrective actions, evidenced by the 11 open queries and recurrent lab unit transcription errors across 5 subjects. The failure to update training records for new staff members represents a GCP compliance gap that must be addressed immediately. While the SC is cooperative, the workload appears to be impacting the timeliness of data entry and query resolution. Close monitoring will continue to ensure the site cleans the data in preparation for the final database lock.