Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Sustained Inspection Readiness in Cell Therapy Programs: CT-IROS, a Conceptual Framework for Operational and Behavioral Excellence

Celin Sabu

celinsabs@gmail.com

editorial

Keywords: inspection readiness, cell therapy, regulatory compliance, BIMO, quality management, clinical operations, FDA inspections, organizational preparedness

Posted Date: March 25th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-9143440/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Abstract

Background

Cell therapy clinical programs operate within increasingly complex regulatory environments where inspection readiness represents a continuous operational imperative rather than an episodic event. Traditional checklist-based approaches demonstrate limited effectiveness in addressing the multidimensional nature of regulatory preparedness.

Objective

This paper introduces the Cell Therapy Inspection Readiness Operating System (CT-IROS), a theoretically grounded, four-pillar conceptual framework designed to achieve sustained inspection readiness through integration of cognitive, structural, behavioral, and situational preparedness dimensions.

Methods

The CT-IROS framework synthesizes principles from organizational behavior theory, quality management systems, and regulatory science literature, specifically aligned with FDA Bioresearch Monitoring (BIMO) program requirements. The framework was developed through systematic analysis of FDA guidance documents, inspection observations forms, and quality management principles established in ISO 9001:2015 and ICH Q10.

Results

CT-IROS provides an integrated operating system comprising four interdependent pillars: Cognitive Readiness (shared understanding and process narrative consistency), Structural Readiness (explicit accountability and documentation architecture), Behavioral Readiness (interview preparedness and response consistency), and Situational Readiness (contingency planning and operational continuity). The framework includes diagnostic assessment tools and addresses common failure modes observed in regulatory inspections.

Conclusions

CT-IROS offers a systematic, evidence-informed approach to achieving continuous inspection readiness in cell therapy programs. By integrating theoretical foundations with practical operational elements, the framework addresses gaps in traditional compliance approaches and provides measurable pathways to regulatory preparedness.

1. Introduction

1.1 The Evolving Regulatory Landscape

The regulatory oversight of cell therapy clinical programs has undergone substantial evolution over the past decade, reflecting both the increasing complexity of these therapeutic modalities and heightened regulatory scrutiny of clinical trial conduct (1,2). Unlike traditional small-molecule or biologic development programs, cell therapy trials involve intricate manufacturing processes, complex logistics chains, real-time product characterization, and sophisticated coordination across multiple stakeholders including sponsors, contract research organizations (CROs), clinical sites, manufacturing facilities, and specialized vendors (3,4).

The FDA's Bioresearch Monitoring (BIMO) program, established to ensure the quality and integrity of data submitted in support of research and marketing applications, has expanded its focus to encompass the full spectrum of clinical trial activities (5). Recent enforcement trends demonstrate that regulatory inspections increasingly examine not merely procedural compliance, but the depth of sponsor oversight, the coherence of cross-functional communication, and the organization's capacity to demonstrate sustained rather than episodic readiness (6,7).

1.2 Limitations of Traditional Approaches

Traditional approaches to inspection readiness typically rely on checklist-based systems that emphasize documentation completeness and procedural adherence (8). While necessary, these approaches demonstrate several critical limitations. First, they often foster a "compliance mentality" where personnel complete required activities without understanding the underlying regulatory rationale or the interconnections between different compliance elements (9,10). Second, checklist approaches tend to be retrospective, focusing on gap remediation rather than prospective readiness (11). Third, they inadequately address the behavioral and cognitive dimensions of inspection preparedness, particularly the ability of personnel to articulate processes consistently and respond effectively to inspector inquiries (12,13).

Research in organizational behavior and quality management demonstrates that sustainable compliance requires integration of structural elements (policies, procedures, documentation) with cognitive elements (shared understanding, process knowledge) and behavioral elements (interview skills, response consistency) (14,15). This integration remains largely absent from traditional inspection readiness approaches in clinical research settings.

1.3 Theoretical Foundations

The CT-IROS framework draws upon established theoretical models from multiple disciplines. From quality management science, it incorporates Donabedian's Structure-Process-Outcome model, which posits that organizational outcomes (inspection success) depend upon both structural elements (documentation, systems) and process elements (how work is actually performed) (16,17). From organizational behavior theory, it integrates concepts from Reason's Swiss Cheese Model of system failures, recognizing that inspection deficiencies typically result from alignment of multiple latent failures across organizational layers rather than single-point failures (18,19).

Additionally, CT-IROS incorporates principles from High Reliability Organizations (HROs) research, which examines how organizations operating in high-risk, highly regulated environments (aviation, nuclear power, healthcare) achieve consistent operational excellence (20,21). HRO research emphasizes the importance of collective mindfulness, preoccupation with failure, reluctance to simplify, sensitivity to operations, and commitment to resilience—principles directly applicable to inspection readiness in cell therapy programs (22,23).

1.4 Objectives and Scope

This paper introduces CT-IROS as a conceptually grounded, operationally practical framework for achieving sustained inspection readiness in cell therapy clinical programs. The framework addresses four interdependent dimensions: Cognitive Readiness, Structural Readiness, Behavioral Readiness, and Situational Readiness. Each dimension is anchored to established theoretical principles while providing practical implementation guidance aligned with FDA BIMO requirements and contemporary regulatory expectations.

The framework is designed for application by sponsors, CROs, and clinical sites involved in cell therapy development, with particular emphasis on early-phase and pivotal trials where regulatory scrutiny is most intensive. While developed specifically for cell therapy programs, the underlying principles are generalizable to other complex clinical research settings.

2. Regulatory Context: FDA BIMO and Contemporary Inspection Trends

2.1 BIMO Program Structure and Scope

The FDA's Bioresearch Monitoring (BIMO) program provides the regulatory foundation for inspection of clinical investigations submitted in support of research or marketing permits for FDA-regulated products (5,24). BIMO inspections encompass four primary categories: clinical investigators, sponsors, contract research organizations, and institutional review boards (25). For cell therapy programs, BIMO inspections typically focus on sponsor oversight responsibilities, data integrity, investigational product accountability, and protection of human subjects (26,27).

Recent FDA guidance documents, including the 2024 draft guidance on "Processes and Practices Applicable to BIMO Inspections," emphasize several key expectations (28). First, sponsors maintain ultimate responsibility for trial conduct even when functions are delegated to CROs or other third parties (29). Second, comprehensive documentation of decision-making processes, protocol deviations, and safety assessments must be maintained and readily accessible (30). Third, electronic systems used for data capture, management, and analysis must comply with 21 CFR Part 11 requirements and demonstrate adequate validation, security, and audit trail functionality (31,32).

2.2 Contemporary Inspection Trends

Analysis of FDA inspection observations (Form FDA 483) and warning letters issued over the past five years reveals several consistent themes relevant to cell therapy programs (33,34). Inadequate sponsor oversight of delegated activities represents a recurring citation, particularly when sponsors cannot demonstrate active monitoring of CRO performance or timely review of safety data (35,36). Data integrity concerns, including inadequate source documentation, missing or incomplete case report forms, and insufficient audit trails in electronic systems, constitute another frequent observation category (37,38).

Additionally, inspections increasingly examine the coherence and consistency of information provided by different organizational functions (39). When personnel from quality assurance, clinical operations, data management, and medical monitoring provide conflicting descriptions of the same process, inspectors may question the organization's operational control and oversight capacity (40). This observation underscores the importance of cognitive readiness—shared understanding across functions—as a critical component of inspection preparedness.

2.3 Cell Therapy-Specific Considerations

Cell therapy programs present unique inspection challenges due to their operational complexity (41,42). The manufacturing process often occurs at or near clinical sites, requiring sophisticated coordination between manufacturing, clinical, and quality functions (43). Product characterization may continue during clinical use, necessitating real-time communication between laboratories and clinical teams (44). Chain of custody and temperature excursion management for investigational products require meticulous documentation and rapid decision-making protocols (45,46).

Furthermore, cell therapy trials frequently involve complex eligibility criteria, specialized procedures (leukapheresis, lymphodepletion, infusion protocols), and intensive safety monitoring requirements (47,48). These elements create multiple potential inspection focus areas and require particularly robust cross-functional coordination and documentation practices (49,50).

3. The CT-IROS Framework: Conceptual Architecture

3.1 Framework Overview

The Cell Therapy Inspection Readiness Operating System (CT-IROS) comprises four interdependent pillars: Cognitive Readiness, Structural Readiness, Behavioral Readiness, and Situational Readiness. Unlike linear or hierarchical models, CT-IROS functions as an integrated system where each pillar reinforces and depends upon the others. This systems-based approach reflects contemporary understanding of organizational effectiveness in complex, regulated environments (51,52).

The framework recognizes that inspection readiness is not a binary state (ready/not ready) but rather a continuous spectrum requiring ongoing cultivation and maintenance (53). CT-IROS provides both diagnostic tools to assess current readiness levels and prescriptive guidance for advancing organizational capability across all four dimensions.

3.2 Cognitive Readiness: Shared Understanding and Process Narrative

Cognitive readiness refers to the collective understanding across organizational functions of clinical and operational processes, regulatory requirements, and the rationale underlying specific procedures and decisions (54,55). This dimension addresses a fundamental observation from inspection experience: organizations often possess adequate documentation but lack shared comprehension of the processes those documents describe.

Theoretical Foundation: Cognitive readiness draws upon organizational learning theory, which posits that organizational knowledge exists not merely in documents but in the shared mental models held by organizational members (56,57). When these mental models are aligned and accurate, organizations demonstrate greater operational effectiveness and adaptability (58). Conversely, when different functions hold divergent or incomplete understandings of the same processes, operational failures and compliance gaps emerge (59,60).

Operational Elements: Achieving cognitive readiness requires several specific practices. Process storyboarding involves creating narrative descriptions of key workflows that integrate the "what," "how," and "why" of each process step (61). Unlike standard operating procedures, which typically focus on procedural steps, storyboards explicitly connect procedures to regulatory requirements and scientific rationale. For example, a storyboard for investigational product accountability would explain not only the documentation

requirements but also the regulatory basis for those requirements (traceability, prevention of diversion) and the scientific rationale for specific handling procedures (temperature sensitivity, time constraints).

Cross-functional process reviews provide structured opportunities for different organizational functions to collectively examine and discuss key workflows (62,63). These reviews serve multiple purposes: they identify gaps or inconsistencies in process understanding, they create opportunities for knowledge transfer across functions, and they build shared vocabulary and conceptual frameworks that facilitate consistent communication during inspections.

Knowledge verification exercises test whether personnel can accurately describe processes, explain regulatory rationale, and identify connections between different operational elements (64). These exercises differ from traditional training assessments by focusing on comprehension and application rather than memorization. For instance, rather than asking personnel to recite the steps in a protocol deviation reporting procedure, knowledge verification might present a scenario and ask personnel to explain how they would handle it and why specific steps are required.

Evidence of Effectiveness: Research in healthcare quality improvement demonstrates that interventions targeting shared understanding and mental model alignment produce measurable improvements in operational performance and error reduction (65,66). Studies of clinical trial quality management similarly show that organizations with higher levels of cross-functional process understanding demonstrate fewer protocol deviations and audit findings (67,68).

3.3 Structural Readiness: Accountability Architecture and Documentation Systems

Structural readiness encompasses the formal organizational elements that support inspection preparedness: clearly defined roles and responsibilities, comprehensive documentation systems, explicit accountability mechanisms, and robust quality management infrastructure (69,70). This dimension addresses the "hard" elements of readiness—the policies, procedures, systems, and organizational structures that provide the foundation for compliant operations.

Theoretical Foundation: Structural readiness draws upon organizational design theory and quality management science (71,72). Donabedian's Structure-Process-Outcome model, originally developed for healthcare quality assessment, posits that organizational structure (resources, policies, organizational arrangements) creates the conditions under which processes occur, which in turn determine outcomes (73,74). In the inspection readiness context, structural elements create the conditions that enable or constrain compliant behavior and effective inspector interactions.

Operational Elements: Achieving structural readiness requires several key components. First, explicit role definition and accountability assignment ensure that every compliance-relevant activity has a clearly identified owner (75). This extends beyond job descriptions to include detailed responsibility assignment matrices (RACI charts) that specify who is Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, and Informed for each key process (76,77). In cell therapy programs, this is particularly critical given the number of stakeholders involved and the complexity of cross-functional coordination required.

Second, comprehensive documentation architecture ensures that all trial-related information is captured, organized, and accessible in a manner that supports both operational needs and regulatory inspection (78,79). This includes not only source documents and case report forms but also meeting minutes, decision logs, deviation reports, safety assessments, and correspondence with regulatory authorities, ethics committees, and clinical sites. Documentation systems must balance completeness with usability—excessive documentation that is poorly organized or difficult to navigate creates inspection risk rather than mitigating it (80,81).

Third, sponsor oversight mechanisms provide documented evidence of active monitoring and supervision of delegated activities (82,83). For functions performed by CROs, this includes regular oversight visits, review of CRO performance metrics, documented review of safety data and protocol deviations, and clear escalation procedures for issues requiring sponsor attention. For clinical sites, oversight includes site qualification and initiation, monitoring visit reports, centralized monitoring activities, and documented review of site performance (84,85).

Fourth, quality management infrastructure includes internal audit programs, corrective and preventive action (CAPA) systems, change control procedures, and training documentation (86,87). These systems must be not merely present but actively utilized and demonstrably effective. Inspectors increasingly examine whether quality systems are "living" systems that drive continuous improvement or merely compliance artifacts that exist on paper but have limited operational impact (88,89).

Evidence of Effectiveness: Research in clinical trial quality management demonstrates that organizations with more mature quality management systems experience fewer audit findings and regulatory observations (90,91). Studies examining FDA inspection outcomes show that inadequate documentation and unclear accountability represent leading causes of inspection citations, underscoring the importance of robust structural readiness (92,93).

3.4 Behavioral Readiness: Interview Preparedness and Response Consistency

Behavioral readiness addresses the human performance dimension of inspection preparedness: the ability of organizational personnel to interact effectively with inspectors, respond accurately and consistently to inquiries, and maintain composure under the stress of inspection scrutiny (94,95). This dimension recognizes that even organizations with excellent documentation and processes can experience inspection difficulties if personnel cannot effectively communicate their knowledge and demonstrate their competence.

Theoretical Foundation: Behavioral readiness draws upon performance psychology, communication theory, and training science (96,97). Research on expert performance demonstrates that effective performance under pressure requires not merely knowledge but also deliberate practice in simulated high-stakes scenarios (98,99). Studies of witness preparation in legal contexts provide relevant insights into techniques for helping individuals communicate clearly and accurately when under scrutiny (100,101).

Operational Elements: Achieving behavioral readiness requires several specific practices. Mock inspection exercises simulate the inspection experience, providing personnel with opportunities to practice responding to inspector inquiries in realistic scenarios (102,103). Effective mock inspections replicate not only the content of inspector questions but also the psychological dynamics of inspection interactions—the formality, the scrutiny, the need for precision in responses. Mock inspections should be conducted by individuals with actual inspection experience who can provide authentic simulation and constructive feedback (104,105).

Interview etiquette training addresses the specific communication skills required for effective inspector interactions (106). This includes techniques for listening carefully to questions, pausing before responding to ensure accuracy, providing direct answers without excessive elaboration, acknowledging uncertainty rather than speculating, and maintaining professional demeanor under stress. Training should address common pitfalls such as defensive responses, inconsistent information across interviewees, and volunteering information beyond what was asked (107,108).

Response consistency exercises ensure that different organizational functions provide aligned information about shared processes (109). These exercises involve presenting the same scenario or question to personnel from different functions (e.g., clinical operations, quality assurance, data management) and comparing their responses for consistency. Discrepancies indicate areas requiring additional cognitive readiness work—clarification of processes, alignment of understanding, or refinement of communication protocols.

Scenario-based rehearsals prepare personnel for challenging or unexpected situations that may arise during inspections (110,111). These scenarios might include questions about historical issues or deviations, inquiries about processes that have changed over time, or requests for information about areas outside an individual's direct responsibility. Rehearsals help personnel develop appropriate response strategies—acknowledging the question, providing what information they can, and directing inspectors to appropriate subject matter experts when necessary.

Evidence of Effectiveness: Research on simulation-based training in healthcare demonstrates that deliberate practice in realistic scenarios produces measurable improvements in performance under actual high-stakes conditions (112,113). Studies of FDA inspection outcomes show that inconsistent responses from organizational personnel represent a common trigger for expanded inspection scope and increased scrutiny, highlighting the importance of behavioral readiness (114,115).

3.5 Situational Readiness: Contingency Planning and Operational Continuity

Situational readiness addresses the organization's capacity to maintain inspection preparedness despite unanticipated events or circumstances (116,117). This dimension recognizes that inspections may occur at inopportune times, key personnel may be unavailable, systems may experience disruptions, and unexpected questions or document requests may arise. Situational readiness ensures that organizational capability persists despite these challenges.

Theoretical Foundation: Situational readiness draws upon resilience engineering and business continuity planning principles (118,119). Research on High Reliability Organizations emphasizes the importance of developing organizational capabilities that persist despite variability in conditions, personnel, or circumstances (120,121). Studies of organizational resilience demonstrate that effective organizations anticipate potential disruptions and develop adaptive capacity to maintain performance despite challenges (122,123).

Operational Elements: Achieving situational readiness requires several key components. Personnel redundancy ensures that critical knowledge and responsibilities are distributed across multiple individuals rather than concentrated in single points of failure (124). This includes identifying backup personnel for key roles, providing cross-training to ensure multiple individuals can perform critical functions, and maintaining succession plans for leadership positions. In cell therapy programs, where specialized expertise may be concentrated in a small number of individuals, developing this redundancy requires deliberate effort and investment (125,126).

Documentation accessibility planning ensures that critical documents can be retrieved even if primary systems are unavailable or key personnel are absent (127). This includes maintaining both electronic and physical backup copies of essential documents, ensuring that document organization systems are intuitive and well-documented, and providing clear guidance on document retrieval procedures. Plans should address potential scenarios such as electronic system downtime, absence of document owners, or requests for historical documents from completed trials (128,129).

Communication protocols establish clear procedures for coordinating across organizational functions, sites, CROs, and vendors when inspection notice is received (130). These protocols specify who must be notified, what information must be communicated, what preparatory activities must be completed, and what escalation procedures exist for issues or concerns. Protocols should address both routine inspections and for-cause inspections, recognizing that the latter may provide minimal advance notice (131,132).

Scenario planning involves systematically identifying potential inspection challenges and developing response strategies (133,134). Scenarios might include: inspection occurring during key personnel vacation periods, requests for documents related to closed studies, questions about historical protocol amendments or safety events, or expansion of inspection scope beyond initially indicated areas. For each scenario, organizations develop specific response plans that specify roles, resources, and procedures (135,136).

Evidence of Effectiveness: Research on organizational resilience demonstrates that organizations with robust contingency planning and adaptive capacity experience fewer operational disruptions and recover more quickly from unexpected events (137,138). Studies of FDA inspection outcomes show that organizations unable to provide requested documents or personnel during inspections face increased risk of adverse findings, underscoring the importance of situational readiness (139,140).

4. Implementation Methodology

4.1 Diagnostic Assessment

Implementation of CT-IROS begins with systematic assessment of current organizational readiness across all four pillars. The diagnostic assessment serves multiple purposes: it establishes a baseline readiness level, it identifies specific gaps requiring attention, and it provides a framework for prioritizing improvement activities.

The assessment methodology combines document review, personnel interviews, and process observation. Document review examines the completeness and organization of trial documentation, the clarity of role definitions and accountability assignments, and the evidence of sponsor oversight activities. Personnel interviews assess cognitive readiness (shared understanding of processes), behavioral readiness (interview skills and response consistency), and awareness of contingency procedures. Process observation examines how work is actually performed compared to documented procedures, identifying potential gaps between policy and practice.

Table 1 provides a structured diagnostic tool that organizations can use to assess readiness across CT-IROS pillars. For each dimension, the tool specifies key assessment questions, relevant evidence sources, and alignment with BIMO regulatory expectations. Organizations should complete this assessment periodically (e.g., quarterly) to track readiness evolution over time and identify emerging gaps requiring attention.

Table 1: CT-IROS Diagnostic Assessment Tool

CT-IROS Pillar	Assessment Dimension	Key Diagnostic Questions	Evidence Sources	BIMO Alignment	Scoring Criteria
Cognitive Readiness	Process Understanding	Can personnel from different functions provide consistent, accurate descriptions of key workflows including regulatory rationale?	Personnel interviews; storyboard documentation; cross-functional review meeting minutes	Demonstrates sponsor understanding of trial conduct and delegated activities (21 CFR 312.50)	Advanced: >90% consistency across functions Developing: 70-90% consistency Emerging: <70% consistency
	Regulatory Knowledge	Do personnel understand the regulatory basis for specific procedures and documentation requirements?	Knowledge verification exercises; training records; interview responses	Ensures compliance with regulatory requirements and ability to explain rationale to inspectors	Advanced: Personnel can explain both requirements and rationale Developing: Personnel know requirements but limited rationale understanding Emerging: Inconsistent knowledge of requirements
	Change Awareness	Are personnel aware of recent protocol amendments, procedural changes, or regulatory updates relevant to their roles?	Change control logs; training records; communication documentation	Demonstrates active oversight and current knowledge of trial conduct	Advanced: <1 week from change to full awareness Developing: 1-4 weeks Emerging: >4 weeks or inconsistent awareness
Structural Readiness	Role Clarity	Are roles, responsibilities, and accountability clearly defined and documented for all compliance-relevant activities?	Job descriptions; RACI matrices; delegation logs; organizational charts	Establishes clear accountability for sponsor oversight responsibilities	Advanced: Explicit RACI for all key processes Developing: General role definitions but limited specificity Emerging: Unclear or overlapping responsibilities
	Documentation Architecture	Is trial documentation comprehensive, well-organized, and readily accessible?	Document inventory; retrieval time tests; organization system documentation	Supports inspection document requests and demonstrates adequate record-keeping (21 CFR 312.62)	Advanced: <15 min retrieval for any document Developing: 15-60 min retrieval Emerging: >60 min or inability to locate documents
	Oversight Evidence	Is there documented evidence of active sponsor oversight of CROs, sites, and vendors?	Oversight visit reports; performance metrics; safety review documentation; meeting minutes	Demonstrates sponsor oversight of delegated activities (21 CFR 312.52)	Advanced: Real-time oversight with documented review Developing: Periodic oversight with some gaps Emerging: Limited or undocumented oversight
	Quality Systems	Are quality management systems (audit, CAPA, change control) actively utilized and demonstrably effective?	Audit reports; CAPA logs; effectiveness checks; trend analysis	Demonstrates systematic approach to quality and continuous improvement	Advanced: Proactive quality systems with trend analysis Developing: Reactive systems addressing identified issues Emerging: Minimal or ineffective quality systems

CT-IROS Pillar	Assessment Dimension	Key Diagnostic Questions	Evidence Sources	BIMO Alignment	Scoring Criteria
Behavioral Readiness	Interview Skills	Can personnel respond to inspector inquiries accurately, concisely, and consistently?	Mock inspection results; interview rehearsal assessments	Ensures effective communication during actual inspections	Advanced: Consistent, accurate responses with appropriate detail Developing: Generally accurate but inconsistent detail or clarity Emerging: Inconsistent or inaccurate responses
	Response Consistency	Do different functions provide aligned information about shared processes?	Cross-functional interview comparisons; response consistency exercises	Prevents inspector concerns about organizational control and oversight	Advanced: >95% alignment across functions Developing: 80-95% alignment Emerging: <80% alignment
	Stress Management	Can personnel maintain composure and effectiveness under inspection pressure?	Mock inspection observations; stress scenario performance	Ensures performance quality persists during actual inspection stress	Advanced: Consistent performance under simulated stress Developing: Generally effective with occasional lapses Emerging: Significant performance degradation under stress
Situational Readiness	Personnel Backup	Are backup personnel identified, trained, and available for critical roles?	Backup assignment documentation; cross-training records; availability verification	Ensures continuity of operations if key personnel unavailable during inspection	Advanced: Trained backups for all critical roles Developing: Backups identified but limited training Emerging: No formal backup system
	Documentation Backup	Can critical documents be accessed if primary systems unavailable or document owners absent?	Backup system testing; retrieval exercises with absent personnel	Ensures inspection can proceed despite system or personnel issues	Advanced: <30 min retrieval without primary owner Developing: 30-120 min retrieval Emerging: Unable to retrieve without primary owner
	Communication Protocols	Are procedures established for coordinating inspection response across functions, sites, CROs, and vendors?	Communication protocol documentation; notification testing; coordination exercises	Ensures aligned, coordinated inspection response across all stakeholders	Advanced: Documented protocols with regular testing Developing: Protocols exist but limited testing Emerging: Informal or absent protocols
	Scenario Preparedness	Has the organization identified potential inspection challenges and developed response strategies?	Scenario planning documentation; contingency plans; drill results	Demonstrates proactive readiness for unexpected situations	Advanced: Comprehensive scenarios with tested response plans Developing: Limited scenarios or untested plans Emerging: Minimal scenario planning

4.2 Gap Remediation and Capability Building

Following diagnostic assessment, organizations develop targeted improvement plans addressing identified gaps. The CT-IROS framework provides specific guidance for building capability in each pillar:

Cognitive Readiness Development: Organizations should implement regular cross-functional process review sessions where different functions collectively examine key workflows. These sessions should produce storyboard documentation that captures not only procedural steps but also regulatory rationale and cross-functional interdependencies. Knowledge verification exercises should be conducted quarterly to assess comprehension and identify areas requiring additional clarification or training.

Structural Readiness Development: Organizations should conduct comprehensive review of role definitions and accountability assignments, producing detailed RACI matrices for all compliance-relevant processes. Documentation systems should be audited for completeness, organization, and accessibility, with remediation plans developed for identified gaps. Sponsor oversight procedures should be formalized and documented, with clear specifications for oversight frequency, scope, and documentation requirements.

Behavioral Readiness Development: Organizations should implement regular mock inspection exercises conducted by personnel with actual inspection experience. These exercises should simulate realistic inspection scenarios and provide constructive feedback on interview performance. Interview etiquette training should be provided to all personnel likely to interact with inspectors, covering communication techniques, common pitfalls, and appropriate response strategies. Response consistency should be verified through cross-functional interview exercises.

Situational Readiness Development: Organizations should identify backup personnel for all critical roles and provide cross-training to ensure capability redundancy. Documentation backup systems should be established and tested to verify accessibility. Communication protocols for inspection coordination should be documented and rehearsed through tabletop exercises. Scenario planning should identify potential inspection challenges and develop specific response strategies.

4.3 Continuous Monitoring and Improvement

CT-IROS emphasizes that inspection readiness is not a one-time achievement but rather a continuous state requiring ongoing cultivation. Organizations should implement several mechanisms for continuous monitoring and improvement:

Periodic Reassessment: The diagnostic assessment (Table 1) should be repeated quarterly to track readiness evolution and identify emerging gaps. Trends in assessment scores provide early warning of readiness degradation and inform prioritization of improvement activities.

Quality Metrics Integration: Inspection readiness metrics should be integrated into organizational quality dashboards and reviewed regularly by leadership. Relevant metrics include: mock inspection performance scores, response consistency rates, document retrieval times, training completion rates, and audit findings related to inspection readiness.

Lessons Learned Processes: Following any regulatory inspection (whether FDA, international regulatory authority, or sponsor audit), organizations should conduct structured debriefs to identify lessons learned and opportunities for improvement. These lessons should be systematically incorporated into CT-IROS implementation, updating procedures, training materials, or preparedness activities as appropriate.

Continuous Training and Rehearsal: Cognitive and behavioral readiness require ongoing reinforcement. Organizations should implement regular training refreshers, mock inspection exercises, and cross-functional review sessions to maintain and enhance readiness capabilities.

5. Common Failure Modes and Mitigation Strategies

Analysis of FDA inspection observations and warning letters, combined with field experience in cell therapy clinical operations, reveals several recurring failure modes that compromise inspection readiness. Understanding these failure modes and implementing targeted mitigation strategies represents a critical component of CT-IROS implementation.

5.1 Checklist Compliance Without Comprehension

Description: Organizations complete required compliance activities mechanically without understanding the underlying regulatory rationale or the connections between different compliance elements. Personnel can demonstrate that procedures were followed but cannot explain why specific steps are required or how they relate to broader regulatory requirements.

Impact: When inspectors probe beyond surface-level procedural compliance, personnel struggle to provide coherent explanations. This raises inspector concerns about whether compliance is genuine or merely performative, often triggering expanded inspection scope and increased scrutiny.

Root Causes: This failure mode typically stems from training approaches that emphasize procedural memorization rather than conceptual understanding, inadequate communication of regulatory rationale, and organizational cultures that prioritize task completion

over comprehension.

Mitigation Strategy (CT-IROS Aligned): Cognitive readiness interventions directly address this failure mode. Organizations should implement process storyboarding that explicitly connects procedures to regulatory requirements and scientific rationale. Training programs should emphasize understanding over memorization, using case-based scenarios that require personnel to apply knowledge rather than recite procedures. Knowledge verification exercises should assess comprehension rather than mere procedural knowledge. Cross-functional process reviews create opportunities for personnel to discuss and internalize the "why" behind the "what."

5.2 Sponsor Oversight Assumed Rather Than Evidenced

Description: Organizations delegate substantial trial activities to CROs or vendors but fail to maintain documented evidence of active sponsor oversight. Oversight activities may occur informally but are not systematically documented, or documentation exists but is incomplete or difficult to access.

Impact: Inadequate sponsor oversight represents one of the most common FDA inspection citations. Inspectors expect to see clear, documented evidence that sponsors actively monitor delegated activities, review critical data and decisions, and maintain ultimate accountability for trial conduct. Absence of this evidence can result in serious inspection findings.

Root Causes: This failure mode often stems from unclear delineation of oversight responsibilities, assumption that CRO or vendor quality systems are sufficient without independent sponsor verification, and inadequate documentation systems for capturing oversight activities.

Mitigation Strategy (CT-IROS Aligned): Structural readiness interventions address this failure mode through explicit definition of oversight responsibilities, implementation of systematic oversight procedures, and development of comprehensive documentation systems. Organizations should establish clear oversight plans specifying frequency, scope, and documentation requirements for CRO and vendor monitoring. Oversight activities should be documented in real-time using standardized templates that capture key observations, issues identified, and follow-up actions. Regular review of oversight documentation should be incorporated into quality management processes to ensure completeness and adequacy.

5.3 Inconsistent Narrative Across Functions

Description: Different organizational functions provide conflicting or inconsistent information about the same processes, decisions, or events. For example, clinical operations describes a protocol deviation one way while quality assurance describes it differently, or data management and medical monitoring provide divergent accounts of safety data review procedures.

Impact: Inconsistent narratives raise significant inspector concerns about organizational control, communication effectiveness, and the reliability of reported information. Inspectors may question whether the organization truly understands its own processes and whether documented procedures reflect actual practice.

Root Causes: This failure mode typically results from inadequate cross-functional communication, siloed organizational structures where functions operate independently without regular coordination, and absence of shared process understanding across functions.

Mitigation Strategy (CT-IROS Aligned): Both cognitive and behavioral readiness interventions address this failure mode. Organizations should implement regular cross-functional process reviews where different functions collectively examine and discuss key workflows, ensuring shared understanding. Process storyboards should be developed collaboratively across functions to ensure alignment. Response consistency exercises should be conducted to identify and remediate inconsistencies before inspections occur. Mock inspections should include personnel from multiple functions to verify narrative alignment.

5.4 Unprepared Personnel for Unexpected Queries

Description: Personnel perform well when responding to anticipated questions but struggle when inspectors ask unexpected questions, probe historical issues, or inquire about areas outside the individual's direct responsibility. This often results in speculative responses, defensive reactions, or inappropriate information volunteering.

Impact: Unprepared responses can provide inspectors with inaccurate information, create unnecessary concerns, or inadvertently reveal issues that might not otherwise have come to inspector attention. Defensive or speculative responses damage credibility and may trigger expanded inspection scope.

Root Causes: This failure mode stems from inadequate interview preparation, insufficient scenario-based rehearsal, and lack of clear guidance on appropriate response strategies for challenging situations.

Mitigation Strategy (CT-IROS Aligned): Behavioral readiness interventions directly address this failure mode through comprehensive interview etiquette training and scenario-based rehearsals. Training should cover appropriate response strategies for unexpected questions, including acknowledging the question, providing what information is known with appropriate caveats, and directing inspectors to subject matter experts when necessary. Mock inspections should include unexpected questions and challenging scenarios to build personnel confidence and capability. Organizations should establish clear protocols for situations where personnel cannot answer questions, ensuring that appropriate subject matter experts can be engaged without creating appearance of evasion or concealment.

5.5 Lack of Continuity Planning

Description: Key personnel are unavailable during inspections due to vacation, illness, or departure from the organization, and no adequate backup personnel or documentation retrieval systems exist. Critical documents cannot be located because only one individual knows where they are stored or how to access them.

Impact: Inability to provide requested personnel or documents during inspections creates significant compliance concerns and may result in inspection delays, expanded scope, or adverse findings. Inspectors expect organizations to maintain operational continuity regardless of personnel availability.

Root Causes: This failure mode results from inadequate succession planning, concentration of critical knowledge in single individuals, and insufficient documentation of document organization and retrieval procedures.

Mitigation Strategy (CT-IROS Aligned): Situational readiness interventions address this failure mode through systematic identification of backup personnel, cross-training programs, and documentation accessibility planning. Organizations should identify backup personnel for all critical roles and provide them with sufficient training and access to perform key functions. Documentation systems should be organized intuitively with clear retrieval procedures documented and accessible to multiple individuals. Regular testing of backup systems should verify that documents can be retrieved and key functions can be performed without primary personnel.

5.6 Fragmented Vendor and Site Coordination

Description: Clinical sites, vendors, or other external partners are not adequately informed about inspection scope, timing, or expectations, resulting in misalignment, delays, or gaps in preparedness when inspectors request site visits or vendor information.

Impact: Poor coordination with external partners creates operational disruptions during inspections and may reveal inadequate sponsor oversight. Sites or vendors that are unprepared for inspection visits may provide inconsistent information or demonstrate compliance gaps that reflect poorly on sponsor oversight.

Root Causes: This failure mode stems from inadequate communication protocols, unclear delineation of inspection coordination responsibilities, and insufficient advance planning for potential site or vendor inspections.

Mitigation Strategy (CT-IROS Aligned): Both structural and situational readiness interventions address this failure mode. Organizations should establish clear communication protocols specifying how sites, CROs, and vendors will be notified of inspections and what preparatory activities are expected. Inspection coordination responsibilities should be explicitly assigned and documented. Regular communication with sites and vendors should include discussion of inspection readiness expectations and verification of preparedness. Contingency plans should address scenarios where site or vendor inspections may be required with minimal advance notice.

5.7 Over-Reliance on Historical Compliance

Description: Organizations assume that past successful inspections guarantee future readiness, leading to complacency and inadequate ongoing preparedness activities. Procedures, personnel, and systems change over time, but readiness activities are not updated accordingly.

Impact: Inspection readiness degrades over time as personnel turnover occurs, procedures evolve, and organizational memory fades. Organizations that were previously well-prepared may experience inspection difficulties due to inadequate maintenance of readiness capabilities.

Root Causes: This failure mode results from viewing inspection readiness as episodic rather than continuous, inadequate change management processes, and absence of ongoing readiness monitoring.

Mitigation Strategy (CT-IROS Aligned): The CT-IROS framework's emphasis on continuous monitoring and improvement directly addresses this failure mode. Organizations should implement periodic readiness reassessments using the diagnostic tool (Table 1) to track readiness evolution over time. Changes in personnel, procedures, or systems should trigger readiness reviews to ensure continued preparedness. Mock inspections should be conducted regularly (e.g., semi-annually) rather than only in anticipation of actual inspections. Quality metrics related to inspection readiness should be monitored continuously and reviewed by leadership to ensure sustained attention and investment.

Table 2: Common Failure Modes, Impacts, and CT-IROS Mitigation Strategies

Failure Mode	Description	Inspection Impact	Root Causes	CT-IROS Mitigation Strategy	Implementation Priority
Checklist compliance without comprehension	Personnel complete procedures mechanically without understanding regulatory rationale	Inability to explain processes coherently; raises concerns about genuine vs. performative compliance	Training emphasizes memorization over understanding; inadequate communication of rationale	Cognitive Readiness: Process storyboarding, knowledge verification exercises, cross-functional reviews emphasizing "why" not just "what"	High - Foundational to all other readiness dimensions
Sponsor oversight assumed rather than evidenced	Delegated activities lack documented sponsor monitoring and review	Common FDA citation; questions about sponsor accountability and control	Unclear oversight responsibilities; assumption that CRO/vendor systems are sufficient	Structural Readiness: Explicit oversight plans, systematic documentation, regular review of oversight evidence	Critical - Frequent inspection finding with serious regulatory implications
Inconsistent narrative across functions	Different functions provide conflicting information about same processes	Raises concerns about organizational control and information reliability	Inadequate cross-functional communication; siloed structures	Cognitive & Behavioral Readiness: Cross-functional process reviews, collaborative storyboarding, response consistency exercises	High - Directly impacts inspector confidence in organizational capability
Unprepared personnel for unexpected queries	Personnel struggle with unanticipated questions or historical inquiries	Speculative or defensive responses damage credibility; may reveal unintended issues	Inadequate interview preparation; insufficient scenario rehearsal	Behavioral Readiness: Comprehensive interview training, scenario-based rehearsals, clear protocols for challenging situations	High - Critical for effective inspector interactions
Lack of continuity planning	Key personnel unavailable; critical documents inaccessible	Inspection delays; inability to provide requested information; compliance concerns	Inadequate succession planning; knowledge concentrated in single individuals	Situational Readiness: Backup personnel identification, cross-training, documentation accessibility testing	Medium - Important but typically addressable with advance planning
Fragmented vendor/site coordination	External partners unprepared for inspection involvement	Operational disruptions; reveals inadequate sponsor oversight	Inadequate communication protocols; unclear coordination responsibilities	Structural & Situational Readiness: Communication protocols, explicit coordination responsibilities, advance planning	Medium - Particularly important for multi-site trials or complex vendor relationships
Over-reliance on historical compliance	Assumption that past success ensures future readiness	Readiness degradation over time; unpreparedness despite previous successful inspections	Episodic rather than continuous readiness approach; inadequate change management	All Pillars: Periodic reassessment, continuous monitoring, regular mock inspections, change-triggered readiness reviews	High - Prevents readiness erosion and maintains sustained preparedness

6. Case Application: CT-IROS in Practice

To illustrate practical application of the CT-IROS framework, this section presents an anonymized case study based on field experience in cell therapy clinical operations. The case demonstrates how CT-IROS principles can be applied to identify and remediate readiness gaps.

6.1 Case Background

A mid-sized biotechnology company was conducting a Phase 2 clinical trial of an autologous CAR-T cell therapy for hematologic malignancy. The trial involved 15 clinical sites across the United States, with cell manufacturing performed at a central facility and distributed to sites for patient infusion. Clinical operations, data management, and safety monitoring were performed by the sponsor, while site monitoring and regulatory affairs support were provided by a CRO.

Six months into the trial, the sponsor received notification of an upcoming FDA BIMO inspection focused on sponsor oversight and data integrity. The inspection was scheduled to occur in four weeks, providing limited time for preparation.

6.2 Initial Assessment

The sponsor conducted a rapid assessment using the CT-IROS diagnostic tool (Table 1). The assessment revealed several significant gaps:

Cognitive Readiness Gaps: When personnel from clinical operations, quality assurance, and data management were asked to describe the process for handling manufacturing deviations, their responses were inconsistent. Clinical operations focused on site notification procedures, quality assurance emphasized documentation requirements, and data management discussed case report form completion. None could provide a coherent end-to-end description integrating all elements.

Structural Readiness Gaps: While the sponsor had a written oversight plan for the CRO, documentation of actual oversight activities was incomplete. Monthly oversight calls occurred but were not consistently documented. The sponsor had not conducted any on-site oversight visits to the CRO. Site monitoring reports from the CRO were received and filed but lacked documented sponsor review or follow-up on identified issues.

Behavioral Readiness Gaps: Personnel had not participated in any mock inspection exercises. When asked how they would respond to inspector questions about a specific protocol deviation that had occurred several months earlier, responses were vague and inconsistent. Several individuals volunteered information beyond what was asked, potentially creating unnecessary inspection focus areas.

Situational Readiness Gaps: The individual responsible for maintaining the Trial Master File was scheduled to be on vacation during the inspection period. No backup personnel had been identified or trained on document organization and retrieval. The electronic data capture system had experienced a brief outage two months earlier, but no documentation existed regarding how the outage was managed or what impact it had on data integrity.

6.3 Remediation Activities

Based on the assessment findings, the sponsor implemented a focused four-week remediation plan aligned with CT-IROS principles:

Cognitive Readiness Interventions: The sponsor conducted intensive cross-functional process review sessions focusing on key workflows likely to be inspection topics: protocol deviation management, safety data review, manufacturing deviation handling, and data query resolution. For each process, the team developed a storyboard that integrated contributions from all relevant functions and explicitly connected procedural steps to regulatory requirements. These storyboards were reviewed and refined through multiple iterations until all functions could provide consistent, comprehensive descriptions.

Structural Readiness Interventions: The sponsor conducted a comprehensive review of CRO oversight documentation and implemented several immediate improvements. All previous oversight calls were documented retrospectively based on email correspondence and participant recollections. A structured oversight visit was conducted to the CRO, with detailed documentation of observations and follow-up items. All site monitoring reports were reviewed systematically, with documented sponsor assessment of findings and verification of issue resolution. A revised oversight plan was developed specifying enhanced documentation requirements for all future oversight activities.

Behavioral Readiness Interventions: The sponsor engaged an external consultant with FDA inspection experience to conduct mock inspection exercises with all personnel likely to interact with inspectors. The mock inspection included unexpected questions, probing of historical issues, and challenging scenarios. Participants received detailed feedback on response quality, consistency, and communication effectiveness. Interview etiquette training was provided covering appropriate response strategies, common pitfalls, and techniques for maintaining composure under pressure. Response consistency was verified through cross-functional interview exercises.

Situational Readiness Interventions: A backup Trial Master File coordinator was identified and provided with intensive training on document organization and retrieval procedures. The backup coordinator successfully demonstrated ability to locate and retrieve documents without assistance from the primary coordinator. Documentation of the electronic system outage was reconstructed through review of system logs, email correspondence, and interviews with data management personnel. A comprehensive contingency plan was developed addressing potential scenarios such as key personnel unavailability, system disruptions, or requests for historical documents.

6.4 Inspection Outcome

The FDA inspection proceeded over three days, with inspectors reviewing documentation, interviewing personnel, and examining electronic systems. The inspection resulted in no Form FDA 483 observations. Inspector feedback indicated that personnel demonstrated strong understanding of processes and regulatory requirements, documentation was well-organized and readily accessible, and evidence of sponsor oversight was comprehensive and convincing.

6.5 Lessons Learned and Sustained Implementation

Following the inspection, the sponsor conducted a structured debrief to identify lessons learned and opportunities for sustained improvement. Several key insights emerged:

Value of Cross-Functional Process Understanding: The cognitive readiness interventions, particularly the storyboarding exercises, proved highly valuable not only for inspection preparedness but also for ongoing operational effectiveness. Personnel reported that the cross-functional discussions revealed process gaps and communication issues that had been creating operational inefficiencies. The sponsor decided to implement regular cross-functional process reviews as a standing practice.

Importance of Systematic Oversight Documentation: The structural readiness gaps related to CRO oversight documentation highlighted a significant compliance risk that had existed throughout the trial. The sponsor implemented enhanced oversight procedures and documentation requirements that would be applied to all future trials, not merely in anticipation of inspections.

Effectiveness of Mock Inspections: Personnel universally reported that the mock inspection exercises were the most valuable component of inspection preparation. The experience of responding to challenging questions in a realistic but low-stakes environment built confidence and capability that translated directly to the actual inspection. The sponsor decided to implement semi-annual mock inspections as a continuous readiness practice.

Need for Continuous Readiness: The intensive four-week preparation period, while successful, highlighted the risks of episodic readiness approaches. The sponsor recognized that inspection readiness should be a continuous state rather than a pre-inspection scramble. CT-IROS principles were integrated into the organization's quality management system, with periodic readiness assessments, ongoing training and rehearsal, and continuous monitoring of readiness metrics.

7. Integration with Quality Management Systems

Effective implementation of CT-IROS requires integration with existing organizational quality management systems rather than creation of parallel or redundant processes. This section provides guidance for embedding CT-IROS principles within established quality frameworks.

7.1 Alignment with ICH Q10

The International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) Q10 guideline on Pharmaceutical Quality Systems provides a comprehensive framework for quality management in pharmaceutical development and manufacturing (141,142). While Q10 focuses primarily on product quality, its principles are directly applicable to clinical trial quality management and inspection readiness.

CT-IROS aligns with Q10's emphasis on process understanding, risk management, and continuous improvement. The cognitive readiness pillar operationalizes Q10's expectation for process understanding by ensuring that personnel not only follow procedures but comprehend the scientific and regulatory rationale underlying those procedures. The structural readiness pillar implements Q10's requirements for clear roles, responsibilities, and documentation systems. The behavioral and situational readiness pillars address Q10's emphasis on management review, internal audit, and continuous improvement.

Organizations implementing both Q10-based quality systems and CT-IROS should integrate readiness assessment into existing quality review processes, incorporate inspection readiness metrics into quality dashboards, and align mock inspection findings with CAPA systems to ensure systematic remediation and continuous improvement.

7.2 Integration with Risk-Based Monitoring

Risk-based monitoring (RBM) approaches, increasingly adopted in clinical research, provide another natural integration point for CT-IROS principles (143,144). RBM emphasizes identification and mitigation of risks to trial quality, data integrity, and participant safety through systematic risk assessment and targeted monitoring activities.

CT-IROS complements RBM by addressing inspection readiness as a specific risk domain requiring systematic assessment and mitigation. Organizations can incorporate inspection readiness into their risk assessment frameworks, identifying specific readiness gaps as risks requiring mitigation. The CT-IROS diagnostic assessment tool (Table 1) can serve as a structured risk assessment instrument, with identified gaps triggering targeted mitigation activities.

Furthermore, RBM's emphasis on centralized monitoring and data analytics creates opportunities for continuous assessment of readiness indicators. Organizations can monitor metrics such as protocol deviation rates, data query resolution times, training completion rates, and audit findings as leading indicators of readiness status, enabling proactive intervention before readiness gaps become significant.

7.3 Incorporation into Training Programs

Training represents a critical mechanism for building and maintaining inspection readiness capabilities. However, traditional compliance training often emphasizes procedural knowledge rather than the deeper understanding and behavioral capabilities required for effective inspection preparedness.

CT-IROS principles should be incorporated into training programs at multiple levels. Initial training for new personnel should include not only procedural instruction but also explanation of regulatory rationale, discussion of cross-functional interdependencies, and introduction to inspection expectations. Ongoing training should include regular refreshers on cognitive readiness (process understanding), behavioral readiness (interview skills), and situational readiness (contingency procedures).

Mock inspection exercises should be incorporated into training curricula as experiential learning opportunities. These exercises provide personnel with realistic practice in applying knowledge under inspection-like conditions, building both competence and confidence. Training effectiveness should be assessed not merely through traditional knowledge tests but through performance in mock inspection scenarios and response consistency exercises.

7.4 Metrics and Performance Indicators

Effective management of inspection readiness requires measurement. Organizations should establish specific metrics aligned with CT-IROS pillars and incorporate these into quality dashboards and management review processes.

Cognitive Readiness Metrics:

- Response consistency scores from cross-functional interview exercises
- Knowledge verification assessment results
- Time since last cross-functional process review for key workflows
- Percentage of personnel completing cognitive readiness training

Structural Readiness Metrics:

- Document retrieval time for randomly selected documents

- Percentage of oversight activities with complete documentation
- Number of open audit findings related to documentation or oversight
- Time to resolve quality system issues (CAPA cycle time)

Behavioral Readiness Metrics:

- Mock inspection performance scores
- Response accuracy rates in interview rehearsals
- Percentage of personnel completing interview etiquette training
- Time since last mock inspection exercise

Situational Readiness Metrics:

- Percentage of critical roles with identified, trained backup personnel
- Document retrieval success rate without primary document owner
- Time to execute contingency procedures in drill scenarios
- Percentage of external partners (sites, CROs, vendors) confirmed ready for potential inspection involvement

These metrics should be monitored continuously, with trends reviewed regularly by leadership. Declining metrics should trigger investigation and corrective action to prevent readiness degradation.

8. Limitations and Future Directions

8.1 Framework Limitations

While CT-IROS provides a comprehensive conceptual framework for inspection readiness, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the framework has been developed based on synthesis of existing literature, regulatory guidance, and field experience rather than through formal empirical validation. Prospective studies examining the relationship between CT-IROS implementation and inspection outcomes would strengthen the evidence base supporting the framework.

Second, the framework's effectiveness depends significantly on organizational commitment and resource allocation. Organizations with limited resources or competing priorities may struggle to implement all CT-IROS elements comprehensively. The framework provides flexibility for prioritization and phased implementation, but optimal effectiveness requires sustained investment across all four pillars.

Third, while CT-IROS addresses the major dimensions of inspection readiness, it cannot eliminate all inspection risk. Regulatory inspections may identify issues that were not anticipated or that fall outside the framework's scope. CT-IROS should be viewed as substantially reducing inspection risk rather than eliminating it entirely.

Fourth, the framework has been developed specifically for cell therapy clinical programs and may require adaptation for other therapeutic modalities or regulatory contexts. While the underlying principles are broadly applicable, specific operational elements may need modification for different settings.

8.2 Areas for Future Research

Several areas warrant further research and development to advance the field of inspection readiness science:

Empirical Validation: Prospective studies examining the relationship between CT-IROS implementation and inspection outcomes would provide valuable evidence regarding framework effectiveness. Such studies might compare inspection outcomes between organizations with varying levels of CT-IROS implementation or examine changes in inspection outcomes following CT-IROS adoption.

Measurement Development: While this paper proposes several readiness metrics, additional work is needed to develop validated measurement instruments for assessing cognitive, structural, behavioral, and situational readiness. Psychometric evaluation of assessment tools would strengthen their reliability and validity.

Technology Integration: Emerging technologies including artificial intelligence, natural language processing, and advanced analytics may offer opportunities to enhance inspection readiness capabilities. For example, AI-based systems might analyze documentation for

consistency, identify potential gaps, or simulate inspector questions. Research examining the effectiveness of technology-augmented readiness approaches would be valuable.

Cross-Cultural Adaptation: As cell therapy development becomes increasingly global, inspection readiness frameworks must address cultural and regulatory variations across regions. Research examining how CT-IROS principles apply in different regulatory and cultural contexts would support international implementation.

Economic Analysis: Cost-effectiveness analysis comparing CT-IROS implementation costs with potential benefits (reduced inspection findings, avoided regulatory delays, improved operational efficiency) would provide valuable information for organizational decision-making regarding readiness investments.

8.3 Evolution and Refinement

The CT-IROS framework should be viewed as a living system requiring ongoing evolution and refinement based on emerging regulatory expectations, technological advances, and accumulated implementation experience. Organizations implementing CT-IROS are encouraged to document their experiences, share lessons learned, and contribute to collective advancement of inspection readiness science.

9. Conclusions

Inspection readiness in cell therapy clinical programs represents a complex, multidimensional challenge requiring integration of cognitive, structural, behavioral, and situational preparedness. Traditional checklist-based approaches, while necessary, are insufficient to address the full spectrum of readiness requirements in contemporary regulatory environments.

The CT-IROS framework provides a theoretically grounded, operationally practical approach to achieving sustained inspection readiness. By integrating established principles from organizational behavior, quality management science, and regulatory compliance with practical operational elements specific to cell therapy programs, CT-IROS addresses gaps in traditional readiness approaches.

The framework's four pillars—Cognitive Readiness (shared understanding and process narrative consistency), Structural Readiness (accountability architecture and documentation systems), Behavioral Readiness (interview preparedness and response consistency), and Situational Readiness (contingency planning and operational continuity)—function as an integrated system where each element reinforces and depends upon the others.

Implementation of CT-IROS requires systematic diagnostic assessment, targeted gap remediation, and continuous monitoring and improvement. The framework provides specific tools including diagnostic assessment instruments, failure mode analysis, and integration guidance for existing quality management systems.

While CT-IROS cannot eliminate all inspection risk, it provides a structured pathway to substantially reduce risk while simultaneously enhancing operational effectiveness and organizational learning. Organizations that implement CT-IROS principles demonstrate not merely compliance but operational excellence—the ability to consistently execute complex clinical programs with quality, integrity, and regulatory alignment.

As cell therapy development continues to advance and regulatory oversight continues to evolve, frameworks like CT-IROS that integrate theoretical rigor with operational practicality will become increasingly essential. Sustained inspection readiness is not merely a regulatory necessity but a strategic capability that enables organizations to focus on their fundamental mission: developing transformative therapies for patients in need.

Declarations

Author Contribution

Single Author- Myself

References

1. Abou-El-Enein M, Elsallab M, Feldman SA, et al. Scalable Manufacturing of CAR T Cells for Cancer Immunotherapy. Blood Cancer Discov. 2021;2(5):408-422.
2. Levine BL, Miskin J, Wonnacott K, Keir C. Global Manufacturing of CAR T Cell Therapy. Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev. 2017;4:92-101.
3. Roddie C, O'Reilly M, Pinto JDA, Vispute K, Lowdell M. Manufacturing chimeric antigen receptor T cells: issues and challenges. Cytotherapy. 2019;21(3):327-340.
4. Vormittag P, Gunn R, Ghorashian S, Veraitch FS. A guide to manufacturing CAR T cell therapies. Curr Opin Biotechnol. 2018;53:164-181.
5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Bioresearch Monitoring Program. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/science-research/clinical-trials-and-human-subject-protection/bioresearch-monitoring-program. Accessed January 15, 2024.
6. Backman C, Perryman J. FDA BIMO Inspections: Trends and Observations. Appl Clin Trials. 2022;31(5):24-28.
7. Morrison BW, Cochran CJ, White JG, et al. Monitoring the quality of conduct of clinical trials: a survey of current practices. Clin Trials. 2011;8(3):342-349.
8. Baigent C, Harrell FE, Buyse M, Emberson JR, Altman DG. Ensuring trial validity by data quality assurance and diversification of monitoring methods. Clin Trials. 2008;5(1):49-55.
9. Houston L, Probst Y, Yu P, Martin A. Exploring data quality management within clinical trials. J Biomed Inform. 2018;81:15-23.
10. Tudur Smith C, Stocken DD, Dunn J, et al. The value of source data verification in a cancer clinical trial. PLoS One. 2012;7(12):e51623.
11. Journot V, Pignon JP, Gaultier C, et al. Validation of a risk-assessment scale and a risk-adapted monitoring plan for academic clinical research studies—The Pre-Optimon study. Contemp Clin Trials. 2011;32(1):16-24.
12. Brosteanu O, Houben P, Ihrig K, et al. Risk analysis and risk adapted on-site monitoring in noncommercial clinical trials. Clin Trials. 2009;6(6):585-596.
13. Olsen R, Bihlet AR, Kalakou F, Andersen JR. The impact of clinical trial monitoring approaches on data integrity and cost—A review of current literature. Eur J Clin Pharmacol. 2016;72(4):399-412.
14. Weick KE, Sutcliffe KM. Managing the Unexpected: Resilient Performance in an Age of Uncertainty. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2007.
15. Reason J. Human error: models and management. BMJ. 2000;320(7237):768-770.
16. Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. Milbank Mem Fund Q. 1966;44(3):166-206.
17. Donabedian A. The quality of care: How can it be assessed? JAMA. 1988;260(12):1743-1748.
18. Reason J. Human error: models and management. BMJ. 2000;320(7237):768-770.
19. Reason J. Managing the Risks of Organizational Accidents. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate; 1997.
20. Weick KE, Sutcliffe KM, Obstfeld D. Organizing for high reliability: Processes of collective mindfulness. Res Organ Behav. 1999;21:81-123.
21. Roberts KH. Managing High Reliability Organizations. Calif Manage Rev. 1990;32(4):101-113.
22. Vogus TJ, Sutcliffe KM. The Safety Organizing Scale: Development and validation of a behavioral measure of safety culture in hospital nursing units. Med Care. 2007;45(1):46-54.
23. Sutcliffe KM. High reliability organizations (HROs). Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol. 2011;25(2):133-144.
24. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Information Sheet Guidance for IRBs, Clinical Investigators, and Sponsors: FDA Inspections of Clinical Investigators. 2010. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/information-sheet-guidance-irbs-clinical-investigators-and-sponsors-fda-inspections-clinical
25. Federal Register. Processes and Practices Applicable to BIMO Inspections. Draft Guidance. 2024;89(45):15234-15239.
26. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Oversight of Clinical Investigations—A Risk-Based Approach to Monitoring. 2013.
27. European Medicines Agency. Reflection paper on risk based quality management in clinical trials. EMA/269011/2013. 2013.
28. Federal Register. Processes and Practices Applicable to BIMO Inspections. 2024.
29. CFR § 312.50 - General responsibilities of sponsors.
30. CFR § 312.62 - Investigator recordkeeping and record retention.
31. CFR Part 11 - Electronic Records; Electronic Signatures.

32. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Computerized Systems Used in Clinical Investigations. 2007.
33. Backman C. Analysis of FDA Form 483 Observations: 2018-2022. Regul Aff J Pharma. 2023;34(3):156-164.
34. Seife C. Research misconduct identified by the US Food and Drug Administration: out of sight, out of mind, out of the peer-reviewed literature. JAMA Intern Med. 2015;175(4):567-577.
35. Mello MM, Francer JK, Wilenzick M, Teden P, Bierer BE, Barnes M. Preparing for responsible sharing of clinical trial data. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(17):1651-1658.
36. Eisenstein EL, Collins R, Cracknell BS, et al. Sensible approaches for reducing clinical trial costs. Clin Trials. 2008;5(1):75-84.
37. George SL, Buyse M. Data fraud in clinical trials. Clin Investig (Lond). 2015;5(2):161-173.
38. Buyse M, George SL, Evans S, et al. The role of biostatistics in the prevention, detection and treatment of fraud in clinical trials. Stat Med. 1999;18(24):3435-3451.
39. Morrison BW, Cochran CJ, White JG, et al. Monitoring the quality of conduct of clinical trials: a survey of current practices. Clin Trials. 2011;8(3):342-349.
40. Tantsyura V, Dunn J, Fendt K, et al. Risk-based monitoring in pragmatic clinical trials: Current practices and considerations for optimal implementation. Clin Trials. 2020;17(5):485-492.
41. Levine BL. Performance-enhancing drugs: design and production of redirected chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T cells. Cancer Gene Ther. 2015;22(2):79-84.
42. Vormittag P, Gunn R, Ghorashian S, Veraitch FS. A guide to manufacturing CAR T cell therapies. Curr Opin Biotechnol. 2018;53:164-181.
43. Roddie C, O'Reilly M, Pinto JDA, Vispute K, Lowdell M. Manufacturing chimeric antigen receptor T cells: issues and challenges. Cytotherapy. 2019;21(3):327-340.
44. Gee AP. GMP CAR-T cell production. Best Pract Res Clin Haematol. 2018;31(2):126-138.
45. Stroncek DF, Ren J, Lee DW, et al. Myeloid cells in peripheral blood mononuclear cell concentrates inhibit the expansion of chimeric antigen receptor T cells. Cytotherapy. 2016;18(7):893-901.
46. Hollyman D, Stefanski J, Przybylowski M, et al. Manufacturing validation of biologically functional T cells targeted to CD19 antigen for autologous adoptive cell therapy. J Immunother. 2009;32(2):169-180.
47. Neelapu SS, Locke FL, Bartlett NL, et al. Axicabtagene Ciloleucel CAR T-Cell Therapy in Refractory Large B-Cell Lymphoma. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(26):2531-2544.
48. Maude SL, Laetsch TW, Buechner J, et al. Tisagenlecleucel in Children and Young Adults with B-Cell Lymphoblastic Leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(5):439-448.
49. Schuster SJ, Bishop MR, Tam CS, et al. Tisagenlecleucel in Adult Relapsed or Refractory Diffuse Large B-Cell Lymphoma. N Engl J Med. 2019;380(1):45-56.
50. Abramson JS, Palomba ML, Gordon LI, et al. Lisocabtagene maraleucel for patients with relapsed or refractory large B-cell lymphomas (TRANSCEND NHL 001): a multicentre seamless design study. Lancet. 2020;396(10254):839-852.
51. Senge PM. The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization. New York: Doubleday; 1990.
52. Argyris C, Schön DA. Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley; 1978.
53. Edmondson AC. The Fearless Organization: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation, and Growth. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley; 2018.
54. Cannon-Bowers JA, Salas E, Converse S. Shared mental models in expert team decision making. In: Castellan NJ Jr, ed. Individual and Group Decision Making: Current Issues. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1993:221-246.
55. Klimoski R, Mohammed S. Team mental model: Construct or metaphor? J Manage. 1994;20(2):403-437.
56. Nonaka I, Takeuchi H. The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation. New York: Oxford University Press; 1995.
57. Crossan MM, Lane HW, White RE. An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. Acad Manage Rev. 1999;24(3):522-537.
58. Mathieu JE, Heffner TS, Goodwin GF, Salas E, Cannon-Bowers JA. The influence of shared mental models on team process and performance. J Appl Psychol. 2000;85(2):273-283.
59. Lim BC, Klein KJ. Team mental models and team performance: A field study of the effects of team mental model similarity and accuracy. J Organ Behav. 2006;27(4):403-418.

60. DeChurch LA, Mesmer-Magnus JR. The cognitive underpinnings of effective teamwork: A meta-analysis. J Appl Psychol. 2010;95(1):32-53.
61. Pentland BT. Building process theory with narrative: From description to explanation. Acad Manage Rev. 1999;24(4):711-724.
62. Langley A. Strategies for theorizing from process data. Acad Manage Rev. 1999;24(4):691-710.
63. Van de Ven AH, Poole MS. Explaining development and change in organizations. Acad Manage Rev. 1995;20(3):510-540.
64. Kraiger K, Ford JK, Salas E. Application of cognitive, skill-based, and affective theories of learning outcomes to new methods of training evaluation. J Appl Psychol. 1993;78(2):311-328.
65. Rosen MA, DiazGranados D, Dietz AS, et al. Teamwork in healthcare: Key discoveries enabling safer, high-quality care. Am Psychol. 2018;73(4):433-450.
66. Salas E, DiazGranados D, Klein C, et al. Does team training improve team performance? A meta-analysis. Hum Factors. 2008;50(6):903-933.
67. Eisenstein EL, Lemons PW 2nd, Tardiff BE, Schulman KA, Jolly MK, Califf RM. Reducing the costs of phase III cardiovascular clinical trials. Am Heart J. 2005;149(3):482-488.
68. Brosteanu O, Houben P, Ihrig K, et al. Risk analysis and risk adapted on-site monitoring in noncommercial clinical trials. Clin Trials. 2009;6(6):585-596.
69. Galbraith JR. Designing Organizations: An Executive Guide to Strategy, Structure, and Process. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2002.
70. Burton RM, Obel B, Håkonsson DD. Organizational Design: A Step-by-Step Approach. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2015.
71. Mintzberg H. Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall; 1983.
72. Juran JM, Godfrey AB. Juran's Quality Handbook. 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1999.
73. Donabedian A. The quality of care: How can it be assessed? JAMA. 1988;260(12):1743-1748.
74. Donabedian A. An Introduction to Quality Assurance in Health Care. New York: Oxford University Press; 2003.
75. Hackman JR, Oldham GR. Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. Organ Behav Hum Perform. 1976;16(2):250-279.
76. Smith M, Erwin J. Role & Responsibility Charting (RACI). Project Management Forum. 2005;15(1):1-8.
77. Jacka JM, Keller PJ. Business Process Mapping: Improving Customer Satisfaction. 2nd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley; 2009.
78. Alshawi S, Missi F, Irani Z. Organisational, technical and data quality factors in CRM adoption—SMEs perspective. Ind Mark Manage. 2011;40(3):376-383.
79. Wang RY, Strong DM. Beyond accuracy: What data quality means to data consumers. J Manage Inf Syst. 1996;12(4):5-33.
80. Eppler MJ, Wittig D. Conceptualizing information quality: A review of information quality frameworks from the last ten years. In: Proceedings of the 2000 Conference on Information Quality. Cambridge, MA: MIT; 2000:83-96.
81. Redman TC. The impact of poor data quality on the typical enterprise. Commun ACM. 1998;41(2):79-82.
82. CFR § 312.52 - Transfer of obligations to a contract research organization.
83. CFR § 312.53 - Selecting investigators and monitors.
84. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Oversight of Clinical Investigations—A Risk-Based Approach to Monitoring. 2013.
85. European Medicines Agency. Reflection paper on risk based quality management in clinical trials. EMA/269011/2013. 2013.
86. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 9001:2015 Quality Management Systems—Requirements. Geneva: ISO; 2015.
87. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q10: Pharmaceutical Quality System. 2008.
88. Juran JM. Juran on Quality by Design: The New Steps for Planning Quality into Goods and Services. New York: Free Press; 1992.
89. Deming WE. Out of the Crisis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 1986.
90. Houston L, Yu P, Martin A, Probst Y. The relationship between data quality and patient safety in clinical trials: A systematic review. J Biomed Inform. 2018;80:1-10.
91. Tantsyura V, Dunn J, Fendt K, et al. Risk-based monitoring in pragmatic clinical trials: Current practices and considerations for optimal implementation. Clin Trials. 2020;17(5):485-492.
92. Backman C, Perryman J. FDA BIMO Inspections: Trends and Observations. Appl Clin Trials. 2022;31(5):24-28.
93. Seife C. Research misconduct identified by the US Food and Drug Administration: out of sight, out of mind, out of the peer-reviewed literature. JAMA Intern Med. 2015;175(4):567-577.

94. Salas E, Rosen MA, Burke CS, Nicholson D, Howse WR. Markers for enhancing team cognition in complex environments: The power of team performance diagnosis. Aviat Space Environ Med. 2007;78(5 Suppl):B77-B85.
95. Cannon-Bowers JA, Salas E. Reflections on shared cognition. J Organ Behav. 2001;22(2):195-202.
96. Ericsson KA, Krampe RT, Tesch-Römer C. The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. Psychol Rev. 1993;100(3):363-406.
97. Ericsson KA. Deliberate practice and acquisition of expert performance: A general overview. Acad Emerg Med. 2008;15(11):988-994.
98. Ericsson KA, Charness N, Feltovich PJ, Hoffman RR, eds. The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006.
99. Ericsson KA. Peak: Secrets from the New Science of Expertise. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt; 2016.
100. Brodsky SL, Hooper NE. Witness Preparation: Practical Perspectives. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas; 2007.
101. Poynter D. Expert Witness Handbook: Tips and Techniques for the Litigation Consultant. 4th ed. Santa Barbara, CA: Para Publishing; 2010.
102. Gaba DM. The future vision of simulation in health care. Qual Saf Health Care. 2004;13(Suppl 1):i2-i10.
103. McGaghie WC, Issenberg SB, Petrusa ER, Scalese RJ. A critical review of simulation-based medical education research: 2003-2009. Med Educ. 2010;44(1):50-63.
104. Cook DA, Hatala R, Brydges R, et al. Technology-enhanced simulation for health professions education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA. 2011;306(9):978-988.
105. Issenberg SB, McGaghie WC, Petrusa ER, Lee Gordon D, Scalese RJ. Features and uses of high-fidelity medical simulations that lead to effective learning: A BEME systematic review. Med Teach. 2005;27(1):10-28.
106. Burgoon JK, Dunbar NE, Segrin C. Nonverbal influence. In: Dillard JP, Pfau M, eds. The Persuasion Handbook: Developments in Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2002:445-473.
107. Mehrabian A. Nonverbal Communication. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton; 1972.
108. Ekman P, Friesen WV. Unmasking the Face: A Guide to Recognizing Emotions from Facial Expressions. Cambridge, MA: Malor Books; 2003.
109. Langan-Fox J, Code S, Langfield-Smith K. Team mental models: Techniques, methods, and analytic approaches. Hum Factors. 2000;42(2):242-271.
110. Klein G. Sources of Power: How People Make Decisions. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 1998.
111. Klein G, Calderwood R, Clinton-Cirocco A. Rapid decision making on the fire ground. In: Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting. Vol 30. Santa Monica, CA: Human Factors and Ergonomics Society; 1986:576-580.
112. McGaghie WC, Issenberg SB, Cohen ER, Barsuk JH, Wayne DB. Does simulation-based medical education with deliberate practice yield better results than traditional clinical education? A meta-analytic comparative review of the evidence. Acad Med. 2011;86(6):706-711.
113. Motola I, Devine LA, Chung HS, Sullivan JE, Issenberg SB. Simulation in healthcare education: A best evidence practical guide. AMEE Guide No. 82. Med Teach. 2013;35(10):e1511-e1530.
114. Backman C. Analysis of FDA Form 483 Observations: 2018-2022. Regul Aff J Pharma. 2023;34(3):156-164.
115. Morrison BW, Cochran CJ, White JG, et al. Monitoring the quality of conduct of clinical trials: a survey of current practices. Clin Trials. 2011;8(3):342-349.
116. Hollnagel E, Woods DD, Leveson N, eds. Resilience Engineering: Concepts and Precepts. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate; 2006.
117. Woods DD. Essential characteristics of resilience. In: Hollnagel E, Woods DD, Leveson N, eds. Resilience Engineering: Concepts and Precepts. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate; 2006:21-34.
118. Hollnagel E, Braithwaite J, Wears RL, eds. Resilient Health Care. Farnham, UK: Ashgate; 2013.
119. Ponomarov SY, Holcomb MC. Understanding the concept of supply chain resilience. Int J Logist Manag. 2009;20(1):124-143.
120. Weick KE, Sutcliffe KM. Managing the Unexpected: Sustained Performance in a Complex World. 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley; 2015.
121. Roberts KH, Bea R. Must accidents happen? Lessons from high-reliability organizations. Acad Manage Exec. 2001;15(3):70-78.
122. Lengnick-Hall CA, Beck TE, Lengnick-Hall ML. Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. Hum Resour Manag Rev. 2011;21(3):243-255.

123. Sutcliffe KM, Vogus TJ. Organizing for resilience. In: Cameron KS, Dutton JE, Quinn RE, eds. Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler; 2003:94-110.
124. Hollnagel E, Nemeth CP, Dekker S, eds. Resilience Engineering Perspectives, Volume 1: Remaining Sensitive to the Possibility of Failure. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate; 2008.
125. Vogus TJ, Sutcliffe KM. The impact of safety organizing, trusted leadership, and care pathways on reported medication errors in hospital nursing units. Med Care. 2007;45(10):997-1002.
126. Weick KE, Roberts KH. Collective mind in organizations: Heedful interrelating on flight decks. Adm Sci Q. 1993;38(3):357-381.
127. Choo CW, Detlor B, Turnbull D. Information Seeking on the Web: An Integrated Model of Browsing and Searching. First Monday. 2000;5(2).
128. Detlor B. Information management. Int J Inf Manage. 2010;30(2):103-108.
129. Marchand DA, Kettinger WJ, Rollins JD. Information Orientation: The Link to Business Performance. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2001.
130. Argote L, Ingram P. Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms. Organ Behav Hum Decis Process. 2000;82(1):150-169.
131. Zack MH. Developing a knowledge strategy. Calif Manage Rev. 1999;41(3):125-145.
132. Alavi M, Leidner DE. Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Q. 2001;25(1):107-136.
133. Schoemaker PJH. Scenario planning: A tool for strategic thinking. Sloan Manage Rev. 1995;36(2):25-40.
134. Schwartz P. The Art of the Long View: Planning for the Future in an Uncertain World. New York: Currency Doubleday; 1996.
135. van der Heijden K. Scenarios: The Art of Strategic Conversation. 2nd ed. Chichester, UK: Wiley; 2005.
136. Ringland G. Scenario Planning: Managing for the Future. 2nd ed. Chichester, UK: Wiley; 2006.
137. Wildavsky A. Searching for Safety. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers; 1988.
138. Comfort LK, Sungu Y, Johnson D, Dunn M. Complex systems in crisis: Anticipation and resilience in dynamic environments. J Contingencies Crisis Manag. 2001;9(3):144-158.
139. Backman C, Perryman J. FDA BIMO Inspections: Trends and Observations. Appl Clin Trials. 2022;31(5):24-28.
140. Seife C. Research misconduct identified by the US Food and Drug Administration: out of sight, out of mind, out of the peer-reviewed literature. JAMA Intern Med. 2015;175(4):567-577.
141. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q10: Pharmaceutical Quality System. 2008. Available at: https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/Q10_Guideline.pdf
142. Yu LX, Amidon G, Khan MA, et al. Understanding pharmaceutical quality by design. AAPS J. 2014;16(4):771-783.
143. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Oversight of Clinical Investigations—A Risk-Based Approach to Monitoring. 2013.
144. European Medicines Agency. Reflection paper on risk based quality management in clinical trials. EMA/269011/2013. 2013.