

M. Elizabeth Igual García<sup>1</sup>, Susana Redondo Capafons<sup>1,2</sup>, Noora Häyrynen<sup>1</sup>, Antonio J. Braza<sup>1</sup>, Montserrat Viñas-Bastart<sup>1</sup>, Carlos Figueiredo-Escribá<sup>1</sup>, Maria Sureda-Rosich<sup>1</sup>, Cecilia F. Lastra<sup>1</sup>, Eduardo L. Mariño<sup>1</sup>, Pilar Modamio<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Clinical Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Care Unit. Faculty of Pharmacy and Food Sciences. University of Barcelona.

<sup>2</sup>Pharmacy Service. Consorci Sanitari Parc Taulí. Sabadell. Barcelona. Spain.

## Voluntariness and Ethics

Clear and structured information is essential for voluntary and ethical participation in clinical trials (1).

## Study objective

To evaluate the quality of participant information sheets / informed consent formularies (PIS/ICF), identify deficiencies, and propose corrective measures to enhance transparency in clinical trial communication.

## Methodology

### Document Evaluation

The formal quality of PIS and ICF in 60 clinical trials approved in 2023 was evaluated.

### Design

Cross-sectional study with validated checklists (AEMPS) and descriptive statistical analysis (2,3).

## Main Results

92.4%

### PIS Compliance

High compliance in Participant Information Sheets.

79.9%

### ICF Compliance

Level of compliance in Informed Consent Forms.

61-96.4%

### Sponsor Variability

Compliance rate between 61% and 96.4%, indicating inconsistencies.

## Identified Deficiencies

48%

Incomplete description of study benefits.

70%

Insufficient mention of confidentiality in the use of secondary data.

72%

Omission of detailed visit schedules.

## Proposed Improvement Actions

### Feedback Protocol

Systematic communication between ethics committees and sponsors to address deficiencies.

### Training Program

Comprehensive training in informed consent drafting according to AEMPS guidelines.

### Annual Quality Review

Implementation of a review system with updated evaluation checklists.

## Conclusions

Standardization of templates and periodic updates of evaluation checklists aligned with current AEMPS guidelines are required to prevent the recurrence of deficiencies and ensure sustained improvement in the formal quality of participant information.

## References

1. Regulation (EU) No 536/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on clinical trials of medicinal products for human use and repealing Directive 2001/20/EC. [Internet]. OJ L Apr 16, 2014. [cited 13 February 2026]. Available from: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/536/oj/spa>
2. Jaramillo Vélez AG et al. Diseño y validación de 2 instrumentos para analizar y evaluar la calidad formal en el proceso de consentimiento informado de ensayos clínicos con medicamentos. Farm Hosp. 2023;47(2):64-8.
3. Agencia Española de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios (AEMPS). Guía para la correcta elaboración de un modelo de hoja de información al paciente y consentimiento informado (HIP/CI). [Internet]. Gob.es. [cited 13 February 2026]. Available from: <https://www.aemps.gob.es/investigacionClinica/medicamentos/docs/anexo8a-Ins-AEMPS-EC.pdf>

