Sarcouncil Journal of Applied Sciences

ISSN(Online): 2945-3437

Volume- 05| Issue- 11| 2025

Research Article **Received:** 25-09-2025 | **Accepted:** 20-10-2025 | **Published:** 03-11-2025

From Melanoma to Liver Cancer: Clinical Data Management in Pivotal Global Trials Supporting FDA Approvals

Shovan Saha

Independent Author, USA

Abstract: Over the past decades, there has been an acceleration of the Oncology Drug development with therapeutic breakthroughs that transformed patient outcomes, even though cancer continues to be a leading cause of mortality worldwide. The quality, accuracy, and compliance of clinical trial data must also be maintained at a high level in order to translate the laboratory findings to regulatory-approved therapies. Clinical data management forms the necessary basis that underlies regulatory filings, therapeutic approvals, and patient access to novel medicines. An example of this is a Phase III open-label, non-inferiority randomized trial that compared the study drug to sorafenib in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma, where careful data management control throughout the study to regulatory submission has resulted in high-quality audit-ready datasets. On the same note, another trial, which is a Phase III randomised-blind, placebo-controlled trial of adjuvant nivolumab versus placebo in resected Stage IIB or IIC melanoma, exhibits complete data management leadership in the development of immunotherapy. The two trials highlight the fact that the Lead Project Data Manager position is not about doing work technically but also about strategic management, cross-functional interaction, vendor interactions, and the integrity of data security in the trial lifecycle. Effective implementation of these key trials sheds more light on the key leadership competencies such as strategic planning, risk management, stakeholder engagement, technical skills, and culture of quality development. Approval of lenvatinib to treat hepatocellular carcinoma and nivolumab to treat early-stage melanoma are the kind of breakthroughs that can be accomplished by excellence in clinical data management, both to rapidly translate scientific findings to life-prolonging treatments and to enhance societal confidence in clinical research.

Keywords: Clinical Data Management, Regulatory Submission, Phase III Trials, Cdisc Compliance, Oncology Therapeutics.

INTRODUCTION

Drug development in oncology has picked up speed dramatically during recent decades, delivering therapeutic advances that seemed impossible a generation ago. Epidemiological reports from 2020 paint a sobering reality—cancer took roughly 10 million lives that year globally—yet mortality trends have been dropping thanks to improved diagnostic capabilities and novel treatment strategies (Siegel, R. L. *et al.*, 2022). It takes something that is often not given to work the laboratory research results into the form of the medication that patients can actually obtain. The FDA and EMA are not interested in a positive outcome; these gatekeepers require evidence that all of the numbers can withstand rigorous examination, that documentation remains intact throughout volumes of paperwork, and that these numbers can be followed by external auditors to their source. At the heart of all these processes lies clinical data management, which forms the foundation behind approval packages and ultimately determines whether patients have access to potential new treatments or not. The Society of Clinical Data Management has come out with detailed guidelines with the explanation that sound data management practices are not additional perks but an absolute necessity to maintain the credibility of clinical research (SCDM, 2013).

Phase III trials on other continents present complications that smaller studies never face. When organizing enrollment across various countries, it is important to struggle with time zones, language issues, domestic laws, and cultural differences, and ensure data flows across electronic capture collections, imaging facilities, lab networks, adverse event databases, and biomarker testing platforms. The streams have their version of the rulebook CDISC requirement, GCDMP requirements, 21 CFR Part 11 electronic signature requirements, and rules, and maintaining everything synchronized is a full-time affair. In cases of lapse of oversight, data quality is compromised, and regulatory reviewers begin to pose sharp questions that can delay approvals by months or even years. Patients waiting for new treatment choices can't afford those setbacks. The Lead Project Data Manager role exists precisely to stop such scenarios, serving not just as a technical expert but as a strategic leader responsible for keeping data pristine, timelines intact, and submission packages ready for regulatory filing.

THE CRITICAL ROLE OF CLINICAL DATA MANAGEMENT IN REGULATORY SUCCESS

Data quality determines whether regulatory submissions succeed or crash—there's really no getting around this basic truth. Clinical data management builds the bridge connecting raw numbers written on case report forms at clinics worldwide with the polished, ready-to-analyze

***Corresponding Author:** Shovan Saha

DOI- https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17516891

datasets that regulators examine during their reviews. Cancer trials throw up especially tough challenges here. Patient groups vary wildly, outcome measurements can take years to show results, and treatment choices literally decide who survives and who doesn't. Research into protocol architecture has shown striking gaps in complexity across medical fields and development phases, with oncology consistently landing among the toughest areas for data professionals (Getz, K. A. 2011). Cancer trials typically track multiple effectiveness markers at once, fold in specialized biomarker tests needing advanced lab work, and run intensive safety monitoring to spot potentially deadly adverse reactions early. Grabbing all this information accurately takes careful planning—designing case report forms that doctors can realistically fill out correctly, programming validation checks that catch real mistakes without throwing up bogus alerts, and setting up quality control mechanisms that verify data integrity without jamming up workflows.

A Lead Project Data Manager runs this entire operation from start to finish. During study kickoff, that means drafting data management plans, laying out every process in detail, writing specifications for automated edit checks that'll flag questionable entries, and configuring quality control procedures that'll run throughout the trial. Once participants start enrolling, attention shifts toward active monitoring—tracking data quality metrics in real time, managing relationships with outside vendors handling different trial pieces, running cross-functional meetings where team members from various departments hash out data questions, and making sure queries get answered fast so the database stays current. As trials wind down, intensity ramps up substantially. Every outstanding query needs resolution, all outside data sources require matching up with the main database, quality control checks need completion and documentation, and datasets must fit CDISC specifications before regulatory filing. Electronic health records and standardized data models have transformed how clinical data is managed, yet major hurdles remain in getting different systems to communicate properly and ensuring information from scattered sources merges into unified, analyzable formats meeting regulatory scrutiny (Kush, R. D. *et al.*, 2008).

Technical chops alone don't cut it for this role—success leans just as heavily on people skills. A Lead Project Data Manager also consumes a great deal of time linking together people: clinical operations personnel enrolling participants, biostatisticians developing analyses, physicians tracking safety signals, regulatory staff developing submission documents, and vendor personnel handling outsourced processes. Diplomacy and perseverance are necessary to get all these groups to agree on what the protocol requires, when deliverables are due, and what will be considered as good quality. This role also requires one to think a few steps ahead and identify any trouble before it arises, and install safeguards that avoid data catastrophes. There is another complication with regulatory requirements. The trials should be conducted in accordance with FDA regulations, such as 21 CFR Part 11, which regulates electronic records, EMA policies addressing data integrity, and CDISC regulations that include SDTM tabulations and ADaM data sets for analysis. Having such technical specs correct can be crucial in eliminating goofs in formatting; the use of different names in the same location, or unfinished documentation, can cause regulatory inquiries that devastate approval schedules or even kill whole submissions.

Large Phase III programs magnify these challenges substantially. Enrolling participants across numerous countries means handling data from dozens or hundreds of sites, each potentially bringing unique quirks or complications. Real-time safety monitoring adds urgency—serious adverse events need immediate attention and rapid reporting to regulatory authorities. In this high-pressure setting, small data quality troubles can snowball fast. A Lead Project Data Manager must stay perpetually alert, keeping strict quality assurance processes running while staying nimble enough to handle whatever curveballs the trial throws.

Table 1: Critical Role - Lead Project Data Manager Core Responsibilities (Getz, K. A. 2011; Kush, R. D. *et al.*, 2008)

Lifecycle Phase	Primary Activities	Key Deliverables
Study Start-up	Strategic planning, Electronic Data Capture (EDC) built as per SDTM/ CDISC requirements, DMP	Data Management Plan, Edit Check Specifications, Data Validation Plan

Publisher: SARC Publisher

	creation, edit check specification	
Study Conduct	Quality metric monitoring, vendor coordination, DQR meetings, data cleaning	Query resolution reports, Quality metrics dashboards, Vendor oversight documentation
Study Closeout	Final validation, database lock, CDISC dataset generation	SDTM datasets, ADaM datasets, Database lock documentation
Regulatory Submission	Dataset review, regulatory package support	Submission-ready datasets, Define.xml files, Reviewer's guides

ADVANCING FIRST-LINE THERAPY IN HEPATOCELLULAR CARCINOMA

The study marked a turning point in liver cancer treatment, tackling hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), the main type of liver malignancy, carrying terrible prognoses and slim treatment options. Liver cancer is one of the gravest forms of malignancy in the world, and the rate of occurrence of the cancer is significantly different in different parts of the world due to variations in various risk factors such as hepatitis B and C, drinking behavior, and the occurrence of metabolic syndrome (Sung, H. *et al.*, 2021). The research was a Phase III non-inferiority, randomized, open-label study, an oral anti-tyrosine kinase multi-targeted, non-inferiority trial versus sorafenib, the only approved first-line systemic treatment of unresectable HCC in more than a decade. The trial registered subjects in numerous countries, and the primary outcome was the overall survival (OS), as well as the most significant secondary outcomes, the progression-free survival (PFS), time to progression (TTP), and objective response rate (ORR).

The magnitude and complexity required complete management of data control between conception and regulatory filing. The leadership duties encompassed the entire range of CDM, starting with the preparation of data management documentation in the course of the initial CDM startup. This involved the development of the Data Management Plan (DMP), which details all operations, timetables, and quality guidelines; the Edit Check Specifications (ECS) that illuminates automated checking reasoning as part of the EDC platform; and the Data Validation Plan (DVP), which establishes protocols for human review of data and to resolve queries. During the process of the study, maintaining the data quality of a multi-centred, international study proved to have its unique challenges. The open-label design meant extra vigilance became necessary to ensure unbiased data collection despite missing blinding. Information flowed from multiple sources, including electronic case report forms (eCRFs), central and local laboratories, independent radiological assessments for tumor evaluations, pharmacokinetic sampling, and adverse event reporting mechanisms.

Clinical investigation showed this multi-kinase inhibitor targeting VEGFR, FGFR, PDGFR, RET, and KIT demonstrated encouraging antitumor effects in patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma, cementing its spot as a valuable therapeutic alternative in this tough disease context (Kudo, M. 2018). Each information channel needed specific quality control protocols, matching-up procedures, and integration methods to guarantee a unified and thorough dataset. Vendor management formed a crucial piece of the data management approach. Several Contract Research Organizations (CROs) as well as dedicated vendors were involved in several aspects of the trial, including site monitoring, data entry, medical coding, imaging evaluation, and lab analysis. As the primary data management contact, it was my responsibility to coordinate the deliverables of these external partners, ensure that they met protocol requirements, dedicated timeframes, and quality expectations.

The meetings conducted by Data Quality Review (DQR) served as a foundation of quality assurance architecture. These quarterly, interdisciplinary meetings brought together clinical operations representatives, biostatistics representatives, medical monitoring representatives, data management representatives, and regulatory affairs representatives to review data quality measures, address emerging trends, and solve difficult data issues. Chairing these sessions made collaborative problem-solving possible and guaranteed that quality worries received prompt escalation and resolution. This forward-looking take on quality management proved vital in keeping dataset integrity intact throughout the extended conduct phase. As the trial moved toward conclusion, database lock preparation became top priority. This process demanded careful planning and coordination across multiple functional areas. All data queries needed resolution or documentation

Publisher: SARC Publisher

with proper justification, all outside data transfers required matching up and integration, and all quality control checks demanded execution and documentation.

Table 2: Trial - Data Management Complexity Factors (Olsen, C. M. *et al.*, 2015; Gershenwald, J. E. *et al.*, 2017)

Complexity Factor	Challenge Description	Management Strategy
Open-label Design	Risk of biased data collection without blinding	Enhanced validation rules, independent data review
Global Multi-center	Data from diverse geographic regions and sites	Standardized training, centralized monitoring
Multiple Data Sources	eCRFs, laboratories, imaging, pharmacokinetics	Reconciliation protocols, integration specifications
Vendor Coordination	Multiple CROs and specialized vendors	Regular oversight meetings, SLA monitoring
Tumor Assessment	Independent radiological review using RECIST criteria	Centralized imaging review, adjudication processes

EXPANDING IMMUNOTHERAPY TO EARLY-STAGE MELANOMA

The trial was an important advancement in the management of melanoma, testing the performance of adjuvant, an anti-PD-1 immune checkpoint-blockade agent, against placebo in patients with fully resected Stage IIB or IIC melanoma. The epidemiological studies have reported that the rates of cutaneous melanoma vary significantly in different groups, where most of the high rates have been recorded in fair-skinned groups residing in areas where sun exposure is high; hence, it is important to note the role of prevention in relation to advances in treatment (Olsen, C. M. *et al.*, 2015). It is a patient population that is at a high risk, with such features as tumor thickness, ulceration, but without lymph node involvement or distal metastasis, and a high probability of recurrence without adjuvant treatment. The main endpoint of the trial was the recurrence-free survival (RFS), and the major secondary endpoints were the distant metastasis-free survival (DMFS) and overall survival (OS).

Keeping study blinding intact required strict protocols ensuring treatment assignments stayed hidden from patients, investigators, and study team members engaged in data review and analysis. This meant careful handling of unblinded data, restricted access permissions, and separate workflows for safety reporting versus effectiveness evaluations. Melanoma staging system evolution has folded in increasingly refined prognostic factors, with current staging criteria emphasizing tumor thickness, ulceration status, and mitotic rate importance in determining patient risk levels and treatment choices (Gershenwald, J. E. *et al.*, 2017).

Leadership responsibilities covered comprehensive supervision of all data management operations from study launch through database lock and regulatory submission. This included working as the main contact for internal stakeholders across clinical operations, biostatistics, medical affairs, pharmacovigilance, and regulatory affairs, plus outside collaborators, including the Functional Service Provider (FSP), Contract Research Organization (CRO), and specialized vendors for imaging review, central laboratory services, and electronic patient-reported outcomes (ePRO). Strategic oversight of FSP/CRO operations is a crucial aspect of the leadership role. The functional service provider model demanded close collaboration and a clear split of responsibilities between sponsor personnel and vendor resources. Keeping ownership of all data management deliverables and milestones ensured vendor performance met contractual Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and quality standards.

Data Quality Review meetings stayed central to maintaining data integrity throughout the investigation. Chairing these cross-functional forums made systematic examination of data quality metrics possible, covering query rates, data completion rates, protocol deviation monitoring, and adverse event reporting punctuality. These gatherings provided a structured setting for spotting data trends, discussing intricate data questions, and reaching collaborative decisions about query resolution strategies and data clarification approaches. Building transparent communication among stakeholders while keeping

Publisher: SARC Publisher

focus on quality objectives ensured potential data integrity worries received proactive attention rather than discovery during the final database review. The blinded trial nature demanded particular attention to safety data management, with adverse events and serious adverse events needing capture, coding, and reporting aligned with regulatory deadlines and pharmacovigilance mandates while keeping treatment blinding intact for the broader study team.

Table 3: - Blinded Trial Data Management Requirements (Olsen, C. M. *et al.*, 2015; Gershenwald, J. E. *et al.*, 2017)

Requirement Category	Specific Challenge	Implementation Solution
Treatment Blinding	Concealing assignments from patients and investigators	Restricted database access, unblinded safety team
Safety Monitoring	Adverse event reporting while maintaining blind	Separate unblinded safety workflows, DSMC coordination
FSP/CRO Oversight	Delineation between sponsor and vendor responsibilities	Clear governance documents, SLA metrics tracking
Database Lock	Multi-phase validation and reconciliation	Staged freeze process, cross-database verification

CROSS-TRIAL INSIGHTS

Leadership Competencies and Strategic Impact

Running both successfully highlights essential leadership capabilities and strategic principles reaching beyond individual investigations, showing clinical data management's broader function in pushing therapeutic innovation forward. The pharmaceutical industry faces substantial economic pressures in drug development, with recent analyses showing that costs to develop and market new drugs have blown past historical projections, mirroring mounting trial complexity, tougher regulatory demands, and the need for bigger patient populations showing safety and effectiveness (Mullin, R. 2014). Though these trials differed in therapeutic focus, study design, and specific obstacles, common threads appeared regarding indispensable capabilities necessary for effective data management leadership in complex, global Phase III investigations.

Proactive risk management and strategic planning were crucial in both studies and had to be heavily planned in the beginning, and risk was assessed across the study lifecycle. Good data management leadership is being able to predict the possible issues well in advance of their manifestation, be it as to the quality of data, vendor operation, or regulatory requirements, or cross-functional coordination, and have preventive actions in place. This prospective mentality, rather than a reactive approach to the problem, was crucial in ensuring the study schedules and data integrity remained on schedule. Another important competitive quality was cross-functional leadership and stakeholder management, as the Lead Project Data Manager works between various functional areas, each with specific purposes, timescales, and priorities. Success demands building collaborative relationships, getting consensus, and navigating competing demands while keeping focus on the big picture goal of data quality and regulatory readiness.

Running quality clinical trials demands solid collaboration and communication among all stakeholders, covering sponsors, investigators, study coordinators, and data management teams, with effective quality management systems serving as the foundation, ensuring clinical data collection, processing, and analysis according to top standards of scientific rigor and regulatory compliance (Bechtel, J. *et al.*, 2020). Vendor management and performance control became a critical capability, as nowadays the complexity of clinical trials requires the involvement of various external vendors and service providers. Effective supervision requires more than monitoring compliance with the contract; it requires rushing into the partnership, a clear communication of expectations, and performance objective evaluation coupled with collaborative problem-solving in case of a challenge. Vendor responsibility, coupled with the desire to establish a positive working relationship, during both trials, was crucial to meeting the deliverable schedules and quality targets.

Technical expertise and regulatory knowledge form a credible leadership foundation. In both trials, the Lead Project Data Manager needed to

Publisher: SARC Publisher

understand not just the technical dimensions of data management tasks but also the regulatory thinking behind requirements and practical implementation approaches. This expertise enabled smart decision-making, effective guidance to team members and vendors, and credible engagement with regulatory affairs on submission strategies. A culture of quality and constant improvement went beyond the establishment of quality control procedures to the creation of a culture in which quality is appreciated, data integrity is non-negotiable, and continuously improving is accepted. These trials offer lessons of wider applicability to the evolving oncology research environment, with trials folding in more and more complex designs with adaptive protocols, biomarker-directed stratification, integration of real-world evidence, and patient-reported outcomes, and ever-increasing demands on data management leadership.

Table 4: Cross-Trial Insights - Essential Leadership Competencies Matrix (Mullin, R. 2014; Bechtel, J. *et al.*, 2020)

Competency Domain	Key Capabilities	Impact on Trial Success
Strategic Planning	Risk assessment, contingency protocols, resource allocation	Maintained timelines and prevented delays
Cross-functional Leadership	Stakeholder alignment, consensus-building, and communication	Improved data quality metrics, reduced deviations
Vendor Management	Performance evaluation, partnership collaboration, SLA oversight	Achieved deliverable timelines and quality standards
Technical Expertise	CDISC knowledge, EDC systems, and regulatory requirements	Enabled compliant dataset generation
Quality Culture	Metrics-driven decisions, root cause analysis, continuous improvement	Progressive data quality enhancement
Adaptability	Protocol amendments, enrollment challenges, and regulatory changes	Navigated trial complexities successfully

CONCLUSION

It is possible to reflect on the trials, which demonstrate the power of clinical data management leadership to drive research innovation and concrete outcomes to patients, creating high-quality, audit-ready data necessary to get regulatory approval. The approvals treat unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma in the first line, and the use of nivolumab to treat in the adjuvant treatment of Stage IIB /IIC melanoma are groundbreaking achievements that have broadened the treatment options and better outcomes among thousands of patients all over the world. Clinical data managers facilitate the rapid transfer of scientific knowledge into therapies to enhance survival, disease progression, and quality of life through careful execution of data management activities, including the implementation of edit checks, query resolution, data quality, cross-functional coordination, and the generation of data that meets the standards set by the CDISC. Clinical data management not only supports fair and accessible access to new treatments in the United States but also can be used to submit subsequent applications to regulatory authorities globally, leading to increased access by different populations and addressing health disparities. Quality clinical data enhances the confidence of the population towards clinical research, since patients, physicians, and regulatory reviewers rely on the assurance of quality information that the data are true, full, and free of any form of manipulation to fit the stringent ethical and scientific standards. The changing oncology environment will keep on requiring clinical data management excellence as new trial designs, including adaptive protocols, basket and umbrella studies, biomarker-based patient selection, and real-world evidence integration, bring new complexities. Digital health technologies, electronic patient-reported outcomes, wearables, and remote monitoring will increase the volume and types of data to be managed, and regulatory considerations of data transparency, such as clinical trial data sharing, and compliance with FAIR principles, will increase demands on effective data governance and documentation. The above leadership skills, demonstrated in strategic planning, cross-functional collaboration, vendor oversight, technical skills, quality culture development, adaptability, and uncompromising adherence to regulatory compliance, will be increasingly important in the field as they move toward more sophisticated and personalized

Publisher: SARC Publisher

methods of cancer treatment that will continue to make a meaningful, global impact on health.

REFERENCES

1. Siegel, R. L., Miller, K. D., Fuchs, H. E., & Jemal, A. "Cancer statistics, 2022." *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians* 72.1 (2022).
2. SCDM, "Good Clinical Data Management Practices," Society for Clinical Data Management, Oct. (2013).
3. Getz, K. A., Campo, R. A., & Kaitin, K. I. "Variability in protocol design complexity by phase and therapeutic area." *Drug information journal: DIJ/Drug Information Association* 45.4 (2011): 413-420.
4. Kush, R. D., Helton, E., Rockhold, F. W., & Hardison, C. D. "Electronic health records, medical research, and the Tower of Babel." *New England Journal of Medicine* 358.16 (2008): 1738-1740.
5. Sung, H. *et al.*, "Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries," *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*, (2021).
6. Kudo, M., Finn, R. S., Qin, S., Han, K. H., Ikeda, K., Piscaglia, F., ... & Cheng, A. L. "Lenvatinib versus sorafenib in first-line treatment of patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a randomised phase 3 non-inferiority trial." *The Lancet* 391.10126 (2018): 1163-1173.
7. Olsen, C. M., Wilson, L. F., Green, A. C., Bain, C. J., Fritschi, L., Neale, R. E., & Whiteman, D. C. "Cancers in Australia attributable to exposure to solar ultraviolet radiation and prevented by regular sunscreen use." *Australian and New Zealand journal of public health* 39.5 (2015): 471-476.
8. Gershenwald, J. E., Scolyer, R. A., Hess, K. R., Sondak, V. K., Long, G. V., Ross, M. I., ... & Sommariva, A. "Melanoma staging: evidence-based changes in the American Joint Committee on Cancer eighth edition cancer staging manual." *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians* 67.6 (2017): 472-492.
9. Mullin, R. "Cost to develop new pharmaceutical drug now exceeds $2.5 B." *Scientific American* 24 (2014).
10. Bechtel, J., Chuck, T., Forrest, A., Hildebrand, C., Panhuis, J., Pattee, S. R., ... & Swezey, T. "Improving the quality conduct and efficiency of clinical trials with training: recommendations for preparedness and qualification of investigators and delegates." *Contemporary clinical trials* 89 (2020): 105918.

Source of support: Nil; **Conflict of interest:** Nil.

Cite this article as:

Saha, S. "From Melanoma to Liver Cancer: Clinical Data Management in Pivotal Global Trials Supporting FDA Approvals." *Sarcouncil Journal of Applied Sciences* 5.11 (2025): pp 1-7.

Publisher: SARC Publisher