Ancillary Studies Evaluation Subcommittee (ASES)

Meeting Minutes

Meeting: May 9, 2016

Present: Chhavi Chadha, Cyrus Desouza, Michael Lewis, Taso Pittas, Rich Pratley, David Robbins, Cliff Rosen, Patricia Sheehan, Myrlene Staten
Absent: Bess Dawson-Hughes (sent comments), Jacqueline Lapointe (sent comments)

Meeting Minutes

1. Ancillary Study Update

- AS14-07 (Huffman, Does vitamin D3 supplementation have an effect on markers of DNA damage?) – resubmitted in February 2016
- AS15-02 (Seyhan, Biomarkers of beta-cell injury and inflammation for the prediction of diabetes) – resubmitted in February 2016

2. Review of Application – AS16-01 John

The investigator proposes to enroll a subset of D2d participants to wear a light-sensing wristband (GT3X+) with the hypothesis that vitamin D measures will directly correlate with exposure detected by the GT3X after adjusting for co-variates and that the contribution of endogenous vitamin D will be higher than exogenous in terms of risk reduction for chronic diseases. Their stated goal is to define the relationship between photosynthesized vitamin D and sunlight exposure measured using a wearable sensor and to decipher the role of endogenous vs exogenous vitamin D to cardiometabolic risk.

The following questions were raised

- The described device has been validated for physical activity and measures luminance, not UVB exposure, which is relevant for vitamin D biosynthesis. The investigator should explain if the device can separate UVB vs. UVA. And if now, how will luminance be correlated with vitamin D production?
- The underlying hypothesis is not sufficiently explained. It appears that the hypothesis is that endogenous vitamin D may be more important than exogenous vitamin D in influencing metabolic outcomes. Is the hypothesis suggesting that there are unknown metabolites being produced via the endogenous vitamin D pathway that may influence metabolic outcomes? If so, how would these be detected?
- Clarification is needed for ASCVD risk score. The implied assumption is that D2d will have cholesterol measures, which are not being measured as part of the study protocol.
- No power calculations are provided for aim 2 and 3.
- There is no risk and very little burden to participants. Indeed, most participants would love to do something added to help the study. The study would probably perk up interest among participants where it seems to lack at around the month 24 visit.

- There is a problem with the start and stop date of the project as written in the application (section 1a). Start date is written as 4-1-2016 and end as 3-31-2016.
- The inclusion of aim 1 in the application was questioned and if it must first be done before aims 2 and 3 can be. Additionally, perhaps aim 1 would be better suited as an R21.
- The regulatory and D2d site staff burden must be described in more detail.
- Patients will have to call into the Boston center after being given information by the D2d sites. The Boston Center will not be able to contact any participants directly as they will not be given any PHI. This may impact the ability to recruit sufficient patients.

2. Review of Letter of Intent – AS16-02 Mello
The investigator proposes to use a subset of the D2d cohort to which to administer a survey to ascertain participants' concerns, attitudes, and preferences related to participant-level clinical trial data sharing.

The subcommittee expressed some interest for the concept presented given the topic of data sharing is an important issue in research. However, there are several concerns:

- There is serious concern that D2d participants may be confused about the concept of data sharing (questions asked in the survey) vs. actual data sharing within D2d. Such confusion may lead participants to question or even withdraw their participation in the D2d repository, depending on how survey questions are written. As such, the subcommittee has determined that the proposal cannot be approved without review of the questionnaire. Inclusion of the questionnaire has been requested upon submission of the application.
- The investigator does no propose to collaborate with D2d investigators. This survey, to be appropriate to administer to D2d participants, must be designed with the D2d study and D2d participants in mind and inclusion of a D2d Co-investigator would be able to provide the necessary input.
- There is some small but real burden to the sites as there will need to be some communication between site staff and the study PI, local and Stanford IRB, and some communication with the participants. Site staff, especially coordinators, are very pinched for time and this will distract from ongoing recruitment and retention.
    - Efforts must be made to minimize the time and effort for D2d site staff. Therefore, subcommittee proposes delaying the review of this proposal until the completion of recruitment with the intent that, *if approved,* the proposed study would begin after recruitment has finished (at the end of 2016).
    - Sites will likely expect to see reimbursement for their time and effort expended by site staff on the implementation of this study.

Next Scheduled Meeting: Monday, June 13th, 2016 at 3:00 pm EDT