2026 Volume: 01 Issue: 03 ISSN 1671-2838 Review Article

Pharmaceutical Care and Research

https://pcrjournal.com Page: 01-17

"AN OVERVIEW ON CLINICAL TRIALS IN MARKET AND USEA COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW ARTICLE"

Mohit Kumar[1], Ranjan Kumar Singh*[2], Tanya Sharma[3], Satpal Kushwaha[4]

[1]Student of Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Mewar University, Gangrar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India - 312901.

[2]Associate Professor, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Mewar University, Gangrar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India - 312901.

[3]HOD, Assistant Professor Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Mewar University, Gangrar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India - 312901.

[4]Assistant Professor, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Mewar University, Gangrar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India - 312901.

Article Received: 16 May 2026

Article Revised: 04 June 2026

Published on: 24 June 2026

***Corresponding Author: Ranjan Kumar Singh**

Student of Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Mewar University, Gangrar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India - 312901.

Doi: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijpcr.6140

ABSTRACT

Most breakthroughs in medicine reach people only after passing through clinical trials. Starting with careful planning, these tests follow tough rules meant to protect everyone involved. Because they measure how well treatments work, researchers rely on them heavily when studying medicines or devices. From start to finish, each step checks safety, how the body handles a drug, and whether it actually helps patients. Only once results meet high standards do therapies move toward broader use across health systems.

This detailed look at clinical trials unpacks how they operate amid shifting markets and everyday medical practice, weaving together findings on trial stages, fresh approaches to study layouts, current rules that shape research, along with worldwide business patterns. Starting far back when testing treatments was basic, the piece follows the journey toward now - where advanced tech shapes complex, modern trial structures.

One decade ahead, the worldwide clinical trials sector could reach between USD 120 and 145 billion, up from about USD 64 to 67 billion in 2025, marking steady yearly gains near 5 to 8 percent. Behind this rise sits heavier spending on innovation within drug and bio-tech companies.

Chronic health conditions are spreading globally, pushing demand higher. New treatments targeting cancer, uncommon illnesses, plus biological medicines also add momentum. Each year brings more complex medical needs, which keeps trial activity climbing.

These days, how clinical trials are set up keeps changing fast. Instead of sticking to old formats, teams now test new structures - ones that adjust as they go, group multiple treatments, or focus on specific gene traits. Technology plays a big role here. Tools like smart algorithms, automated pattern detection, online data systems, body-worn monitors, and virtual care setups help bring patients in quicker.

Speed matters more than ever. Getting things done faster without losing quality has become a clear goal across research sites. Efficiency isn't just talked about - it shows up in daily workflows. Digital support makes coordination smoother between doctors, participants, and analysts. Progress moves ahead even when people stay apart.

Putting patients first in study planning might help. When rules align across countries, things could shift. Full reporting of test results by law tends to support fairness. Without shared standards, gains may stay uneven. Growth in medical testing happens fast now - outcomes should reflect real needs everywhere.

KEYWORDS: Adaptive trial design, Decentralized trials, Good Clinical Practice (GCP), Real-World evidence, Oncology trials

INTRODUCTION

Most times, testing happens under tight plans meant to check how well new treatments work in people. Instead of guessing, researchers watch closely as they study medicines, shots, devices, even surgeries meant to help health. From start to finish, these tests track reactions, benefits, risks - everything that matters when trying something unknown. Think molecules made in labs, fixes built from living cells, or tools shaped by engineers - all pass through here first. What counts most? Proof strong enough for global watchdogs who decide what gets approved. Behind every green light you see, there was likely one of these trials running years ahead.[1]

Out there past lab coats and university halls, real impact begins. Where test tubes meet people, that phase shifts everything - ideas face reality when tested on those who need them most. Picture progress halting if studies lack care or fairness; trust crumbles, approvals stall, treatments vanish. Solid trials hold up every pill approved, each guideline followed, all patient choices backed by proof.

Two decades ago, growth began climbing fast in worldwide medical testing. Pushed forward by big spending on drug and bio-tech science work, progress took hold. New ways to aim at disease markers in cancer, immune disorders, rare conditions kept things moving. Better methods for running tests played a role, one step after another. Digital tools and smart number crunching spread through labs and offices quietly. Experts see this pace sticking around much longer now. Numbers may hit between

120 and 145 billion dollars globally before 2035 passes by. Fresh treatments being needed more often keeps pressure high everywhere. Research spreading across countries adds fuel without slowing down.[2]

What sets today's clinical studies apart? A shift in how trials are built. Not just step-by-step formats anymore - though those still anchor proof of treatment success - newer models now share the stage. When early results point a certain way, adaptive methods let researchers adjust course without starting over. Instead of separate tests for each drug, one shared framework can run several at once, like platform setups do. Some approaches match patients to treatments using biological markers, grouping different diseases by common traits rather than location or name. Tumors vary wildly between people, making these tailored strategies especially useful in cancer work.

Out here, far from old ways, trials now move through homes via screens and apps. Phones check pulses while video talks replace waiting rooms. This shift? It started small - cameras on laptops first, then sensors stuck to skin. Not every test fits, yet many do just fine without clinics at all. Distance slips away when data travels fast. Some folks hesitate, unsure if trust can stretch that wide. Still, visits shrink, schedules loosen, logs fill themselves. Behind it all: less paper, more signals sent quiet-like across networks.[3]

Right now, change is everywhere in how medical studies are run - this look back covers everything from old roots to new tools. Starting with where trials began, it moves through rules that guide them, choices about fairness, systems meant to oversee work, who controls what in business, tech shaking things up, plus paths ahead. Pieced together using solid findings from trusted journals, official directives, and deep market reports available by 2026. Seen whole, it gives useful clarity for drug developers, doctors testing treatments, rule enforcers, health planners, company leaders. Not just facts stacked - more like a map built from real ground seen over time.[4]

History and Development of Clinical Trials

Early Origins

Long before labs and data charts, people already wrestled with how to test treatments. From ancient times, one story stands out - Daniel in the Bible suggesting a trial by diet, watching who fared better without royal food. That moment hints at something like what we now call a study, even if simple. Elsewhere, healers in India and China watched results closely, tracking remedies across patients. These efforts lacked strict controls, yet they carried an intent familiar today: compare, observe, learn.

Twentieth Century Developments

Back then, around the 1900s, new ways of testing treatments began to take shape. Insulin came along in the 1920s to help people with diabetes, shifting how doctors thought about cures. By the next decade, a type of antibiotic was found - those sulfonamides - that changed infection care. Then, during WWII, scientists dug into how penicillin actually worked inside the body. Each step pushed medicine

toward more structured tests on what works. Still, most studies at the time skipped strict side-by-side comparisons.

Back in 1948, everything shifted - modern methods for testing treatments took a sharp turn forward. That year, the British Medical Research Council dropped findings from what was truly the first fair test using chance to assign patients. The drug in question? Streptomycin, aimed at tackling lung-based tuberculosis. A man named Austin Bradford Hill shaped how it would work, while Philip D'Arcy Hart guided things on the ground. What emerged wasn't just data - it became the model, quietly setting rules that still echo today.[5]

Back then, babies started showing up with serious arm and leg problems - turns out their mothers had taken a sleep aid called thalidomide while pregnant. That shockwave hit hard across continents during the late 50s into the early 60s. Because of it, rules began shifting in unexpected ways. Instead of just hoping medications worked, authorities demanded real data. Take the U.S. - lawmakers passed updates in 1962 forcing companies to prove both safety and actual effect before selling anything. Officials their tightened oversight, demanding stricter human trials. Across the Atlantic, nations reacted much the same way. Proof became mandatory. Trials needed control groups. Approval could wait until facts lined up. Before green lights went on, solid results were now required. This moment reshaped how medicines entered society.[6]

Modern Times Shaping Worldwide Systems

Lately, a steady push has shaped how medical trials are run across nations. Helsinki's guidelines came into view when doctors globally agreed on rules back in 1964 - those ideas shifted over time through updates. Across the Atlantic, a U.S. paper from 1979 laid out fairness, care for individuals, and doing good as core anchors for studies involving people. What started decades ago now echoes in labs, clinics, and review boards far beyond where it began.

Clinical Trial Phases and Study Designs

Classification by Phase

Most studies testing new medicines move through four stages. From tiny groups checking basic reactions comes wider use tracking results over time. Safety first gets studied closely before bigger tests begin later on. After approval some keep watching how people respond years down the line. Each step builds differently than the one prior, shaping how treatments get understood.

Phase I: First-in-Human Safety Studies

First up, people get their first look at a brand-new drug during what scientists call Phase I trials. Safety comes first here - researchers want to see how well humans handle the substance, plus they track side effects closely. Instead of just checking reactions, these tests also follow where the drug goes inside the body: how it spreads, changes, gets used up, then leaves. One key goal? Finding out

the highest amount someone can take without serious harm - that number guides future doses. Most early studies include fewer than one hundred individuals; usually adults who are not sick, but sometimes those fighting severe illnesses like cancer join when the treatment is meant for them. These choices shape the path ahead without rushing conclusions.[7]

Phase Two Testing Initial Results and Adjusting Dosage

Some two hundred people might join these tests, sometimes more. Early signs of whether a treatment works begin to show here. Safety gets another look, now among those who have the illness. The right amount of medicine starts coming into focus. Later rounds depend on what doses seem best. A split appears in some cases: first hints of effect, then tuning how much to give. Not every team uses that split, but many do.[8]

Phase Three Final Testing of Effectiveness and Safety

Big tests called Phase III trials check if a new treatment really works, how safe it is, because they need solid proof before approval. These studies follow many people - sometimes thousands - for long stretches, since some illnesses take time to track. While earlier phases look at small groups, this stage happens under settings much like regular medical care so findings reflect actual use. Because regulators demand strong data, outcomes here become the core support when companies ask for permission to sell drugs everywhere. Although timing varies based on disease type or what doctors measure, one thing stays true: without these results, most treatments go no further.[9]

Phase Four Ongoing Monitoring After Release

Once a medicine gets official clearance and hits the market, researchers keep tracking it through Phase IV work. Long stretches of time reveal how well it holds up across diverse groups - people not usually included during initial testing often show different responses. Because real life is messier than clinical settings, these observations catch rare or slow-building side effects missed before. Some folks taking it might be older, younger, or dealing with organ issues rarely studied earlier.[11] New ways to deliver the treatment sometimes come into play later on. Even cost-related insights grow clearer once usage spreads widely. Decisions about coverage by insurers gain support from actual outcomes seen outside controlled environments.

Later on, research takes many shapes - some watch patients over time without interference. Others pull details from medical logs or billing records to spot trends. These efforts often run alongside practical experiments that mirror everyday care settings. Regulators sometimes require safety checks after a product enters the market. Information gathered this way adds depth when looked at beside results from earlier tests. Real-life evidence, drawn straight from clinics and databases, now plays a growing role once only reserved for structured trials.[10]

Table 1: Summary of Clinical Trial Phases.

Phase	Population	Primary Objective	Sample Size	Duration
Phase I	Healthy volunteers/patients	Safety, PK, dose finding	20–100	Weeks to months
Phase II	Target disease patients	Preliminary efficacy, safety, dosing	100–300	6–24 months
Phase III	Large patient population	Confirmatory efficacy and safety	300–3000+	1–5 years
Phase IV	Real-world patients	Post-marketing surveillance, long-term safety	Thousands+	Ongoing

Innovative Trial Designs Adaptive Designs

Midway through some trials, changes can happen - built-in adjustments guided by early results. These tweaks follow strict plans made ahead of time. One look at partial outcomes might prompt a shift in group sizes, depending on how strong the signals appear. Instead of sticking rigidly to equal splits, patients could be steered more often toward treatments doing better so far. Some studies blend what used to be separate stages, moving straight from picking doses to proving they work under one roof. If things clearly tilt toward failure or clear success, certain stop points let researchers pause things earlier than planned. Rules drawn up front keep everything reliable even when paths change.[12]

Platform And Master Protocol Trials

One step beyond traditional designs, platform trials - sometimes called master protocols - reshape how studies unfold. Running under one overarching plan, these setups test several new treatments at once. As results come in, therapies join or exit depending on clear rules about performance and safety. Built-in resources get reused. Control groups stay consistent across tests. Data gathering follows uniform steps. Efficiency rises because everything works together instead of in isolation.[13]

Midway through the pandemic, a UK-based study called RECOVERY tested many possible treatments at once using one flexible system. Because it could adapt quickly, results came fast - like proof that dexamethasone cuts death rates. Elsewhere, cancer research took a parallel leap. Projects like I-SPY and BATTLE began shaping trials around patient biomarkers, shifting focus in real time. One design replaced rigid phases with fluid learning. Speed emerged not from shortcuts but structure. Evidence built steadily, without waiting for old models to finish.[14]

Decentralized Clinical Trials

Away from crowded clinics, parts of medical studies now happen where people live. When patients join, they might sign up online instead of on paper forms. At home, someone could take medicine mailed straight to their door. Doctors check progress through video calls, skipping office visits.

Sensors worn like watches send health data automatically. Instead of driving far for tests, local clinics nearby help collect results. Even side effects get reported using apps that update study teams right away. Technology such as digital surveys keeps conversations between participants and researchers open. Each step adapts around daily life, reducing trips and fitting routines more easily. Remote methods reshape how evidence is gathered, one household at a time.[15]

Ethical Guidelines and Rules Around Technology Use

Foundational Ethical Principles

Starting with fairness in testing treatments on people, clear rules took shape after past wrongs came to light. Though written long ago, ideas keep shifting slightly as culture changes its mind about right and wrong. A paper called the Declaration of Helsinki began in 1964 through doctors' groups worldwide, updated again in 2013, still being tweaked today behind closed doors. Built into it: safety comes before data, before progress, always ahead of curiosity. Before any study moves forward, a team outside the project must sign off - no exceptions allowed. Each person joining must say yes freely, knowing what might happen, without pressure or confusion. Reducing harm matters deeply; at the same time, possible gains should be as strong as they can get. Findings? They belong out in the open, not hidden away once done.[16]

Informed Consent

Starting with respect, agreement before taking part rests at the heart of fair study rules. Willing involvement means no pressure, no unfair sway - just clear personal choice. Because understanding matters, people need full details about goals, steps, dangers, gains, options, and their own rights, shared plainly. Since minds differ, only those able to grasp what they're agreeing to can sign on legally andthoughtfully. When kids join, or folks who struggle mentally, or people locked up, or those hit hard by poverty - the rules shift carefully to shield them more.[17]

Out there, e-consent tools are changing how people agree to join trials - screens now show videos, quizzes pop up, understanding gets checked on the spot. These shifts make signing up clearer, especially when studies stretch across countries or happen remotely. Not far behind, both the FDA and EMA have given nods to these digital methods, so long as personal data stays safe and identities are confirmed properly.[18]

Good Clinical Practice and the Updated ICH Guidelines

Right from the start, how studies are planned matters just as much as how they're run - that's what the latest version of ICH guidelines shows. By early 2025, the updated E6(R3) outline became the global touchstone for managing every step of human trials. Instead of separate rules everywhere, countries now follow one clear path covering oversight, checks, paperwork, review methods, plus results sharing. Because people taking part must stay safe, their dignity and health come first at each point

along the way. Since trust in findings depends on honest procedures, solid data relies entirely on sticking to these practices. Every big medicine region makes it mandatory; without meeting GCP terms, regulators won't accept any study outcomes.

Changes in ICH E6(R3), compared to E6(R2), show how clinical trials have evolved alongside technology. Instead of treating every part of a study the same, teams now aim efforts where risks matter most - this comes from stronger focus on risk-based quality management. Tools like remote oversight, digital platforms, and central statistical checks are officially acknowledged here, unlike before. Real-world evidence gets clearer direction too, helping shape better decisions. Diversity in who joins studies receives more weight, pushing designs to reflect broader populations. Monitoring shifts away from one-size-fits-all methods, guided by what actually affects patient safety and data reliability. Regulatory Frameworks Across Major Markets

Rules for testing medicines in people come from many different country and global systems. Even though these rules often match up thanks to international talks, each place still has its own unique demands. Overseeing such tests in America falls mainly to the FDA. This agency uses two big laws - the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act along with the Public Health Service Act - to set the terms. Anyone wanting to try a new drug on humans needs approval first. That means sending lab results,study plans, and details about who will run the trial - all reviewed before even one person gets a dose.[19]

Now running across Europe, the Clinical Trials Regulation (CTR) EU No 536/2014 shapes how studies on medicines are managed since it fully launched in January 2022. Instead of dealing with separate country-based processes, researchers now file through one shared tool - the Clinical Trials Information System (CTIS). Built for approvals, updates, and oversight, this single-entry point covers every EU nation. Because everything links together, companies planning trials in multiple countries face far less paperwork than before.[20]

India oversees clinical trials through the CDSCO, guided by the Drugs and Cosmetics Act from 1940 along with the 2019 rules on new drugs and trials. Because of the 2019 update, academic studies now move faster toward approval. For medicines already cleared in certain countries, local testing might no longer be needed. On top of that, people joining trials are set to receive stronger financial safeguards if harmed. Ethics panels must follow stricter steps to register and keep their standing. As a result, running clinical studies in India has become more predictable. Over time, this shift has shaped how teams view the country when planning global trials.[21]

Methods and Measures in Medical Studies

Endpoint Selection

Picking the right main and backup goals shapes how well a study can find answers plus satisfy rules needed to get a treatment approved. What counts as success in a trial has to be spelled out ahead of time, shown through results tied to the therapy being tested. Some measures track actual changes in

health or lifespan. Others rely on lab numbers thought to hint at those shifts down the line. How patients rate their pain, daily function, or general well-being becomes data too. Sometimes several types of medical events are bundled together into one overall result to watch.[22]

These days, health regulators want main study results to clearly show real patient benefits or well-accepted stand-ins for them. Take the FDA's rules on cancer trial goals - put out in 2018 and revised by 2024 - they draw a line between outcomes strong enough for full approval, like living longer or certain symptom reports from patients, compared with weaker markers that might only get a drug fast-tracked, such as tumor shrinkage or delay in disease worsening. How these rules shift over time shows how experts now grasp better than before the tangled links among lab findings, observable health changes, and what matters most to people getting treated.[23]

Key Statistical Concepts

Most clinical trial methods follow clear rules so findings stay trustworthy and fair. Because people get assigned treatments by chance, differences in outcomes can actually be tied to the treatment itself. This randomness spreads both seen and unseen influences evenly between groups. When researchers want extra control, they sort participants into subgroups first before assigning them randomly. That way, important traits like age or disease stage stay balanced. For smaller studies, a method called minimization adjusts assignments on the fly, handling several variables without needing large numbers.[24]

Getting the number of people right matters right from the start. Most studies aim to spot real health changes, needing enough participants so results aren't just luck. Power sits usually at 80 or 90 percent. That means there's a strong chance to catch a difference when it's actually there. Mistakes happen either way - too few people might overlook benefits that are present. Too many brings extra patients into testing without good reason. Wasting effort follows. The false alarm rate stays fixed, often at five out of a hundred tries. Two-sided checks keep things balanced. Missed chances sit on one end. Unneeded exposure shows up on the other.

Starting off, the intention-to-treat approach counts every person originally assigned to a group, even if they never took the treatment or dropped out mid-way. Though it sounds basic, this method stays firm as the main way regulators judge effectiveness in definitive studies. On another note, researchers sometimes also run a per-protocol check - this one look just at those who followed all rules exactly. Because that version leaves people out based on how well they stuck to the plan, it can skew results. So instead of standing alone, it usually tags along as extra insight rather than the lead finding.

When looking at how long it takes for events like death to happen, researchers often rely on the Kaplan-Meier approach to map out survival chances over time; meanwhile, differences between groups are checked through the log-rank test. Instead of just comparing raw numbers, the Cox model helps measure how much more likely one group faces an outcome than another, factoring in other variables that might influence results. These hazard ratios come with confidence intervals - bands

showing where the real effect might lie - narrow ones suggest sharper clarity, wider one's hint at more uncertainty. What lies behind each interval is simply a reflection of data stability, nothing more.[25]

Starting with what we already think might happen, then adjusting as new results come in - this way of working fits well when testing treatments early on. As numbers roll in from lab tests or first human trials, guesses get fine-tuned using math that handles uncertainty naturally. Instead of sticking rigid to old plans, teams tweak how many people join based on real time signals. Moving smoothly between stages becomes possible because conclusions build step by step. Decisions midway through don't shut down options - they open paths guided by evolving evidence.[26]

Meta Analysis and Systematic Reviews

Putting together findings from several separate studies on one topic - this is what a meta-analysis does - sits at the top of the evidence ladder in medical research. Instead of looking at just one trial, it combines outcomes using special math formulas that give stronger weight to larger or clearer studies. One model treats all data as if coming from similar sources; another allows room for differences between them. Because of this blending, answers about how well treatments work often become sharper and more reliable. Sometimes patterns appear only when many results are viewed together - like varying responses among different groups or locations. Odd gaps in available reports might suggest some studies never saw daylight, which tools like funnel plots help uncover by spotting lopsidedness in published work.[27]

Working together across countries, the Cochrane Collaboration brings together researchers who independently review medical studies. Their findings appear in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews - a collection known for careful methods and broad coverage of health research. When putting these reviews together, authors often follow PRISMA guidelines to structure their work clearly. For single randomized trials, CONSORT offers a similar framework, helping teams report results consistently. Because of such standards, others can better understand how conclusions were reached. Clarity like this supports trust in what the data show.[28]

Global clinical trials market how it works and changesmarket size and growth over time

Right now, testing new medicines around the world makes up a big part of how drugs get made. Reports say that number sat between 64 and 67 billion dollars back in 2025. Growth keeps moving - some forecasts show it could hit anywhere from 120 to 145 billion by 2035. That kind of rise would mean steady yearly increases near 5 to 8 percent. But if you count more types of trial-related work, some numbers go higher. One study points to nearly 158.1 billion by 2034, ticking upward at about 6.12 percent each year.[29]

Growth keeps going, pulled forward by what people want and what companies can deliver. Pressure builds on drug makers and biotech firms to swap older products losing patent protection with fresh treatments, pushing research spending higher than ever before. As more people live longer and habits shift, long-term illnesses like heart problems, cancer, diabetes, brain-related issues, and joint troubles

spread wider. This steady rise in health challenges fuels ongoing need for different kinds of medical solutions.[30]

Now comes a wave of precise treatments shaped by progress in genes, proteins, and cellular science - filling research pipelines fast. New kinds of cures have arrived: fixing faulty DNA, reprogramming cells, using RNA signals, linking antibodies to drugs - all pushing medicine into unknown zones. These breakthroughs bring higher stakes; testing them demands deeper expertise, more resources, longer timelines. As trials grow harder to run, the need grows too - for teams who know exactly how to move through the maze.[31]

Table 2: Global Clinical Trials Market — Regional Overview. (2025)

Region	Market Share (2025)	Key Drivers	CAGR (2025–2035)
North America	~40%	High R&D spend, strong regulatory infrastructure	5–7%
Europe	~25%	Harmonized regulations, academic research strength	5–6%
Asia-Pacific	~22%	Large patient pools, lower costs, growing CRO capacity	7–9%
Rest of World	~13%	Emerging patient populations, expanding access	6–8%

Contract Research Organizations (CROs)

The CRO industry has been one of the principal beneficiaries and enablers of the global clinical trials market expansion. CROs provide pharmaceutical and biotechnology sponsors with outsourced clinical development services ranging from pre-IND regulatory strategy and study design through site selection, patient recruitment, clinical operations management, data management, biostatistics, medical writing, and regulatory submission support. The global CRO services market, a major component of the overall clinical trials market, has grown substantially and is dominated by a small number of large full-service global CROs alongside a broader ecosystem of specialized boutique firms.[32]

The trend toward strategic partnerships and preferred provider relationships between major pharmaceutical sponsors and a small number of large CROs—sometimes characterized as "functional service provider" (FSP) or "functional outsourcing" models—has intensified, particularly among large-cap pharmaceutical companies seeking to standardize processes, leverage scale, economies, and reduce vendor management complexity. At the same time, smaller biotech companies, which often lack internal clinical operations capabilities, rely almost entirely on CROs to execute their clinical programs, making CRO selection and management a critical success factor for the biotech sector.[33]

Rare Diseases and Precision Medicine

Rare diseases—defined in the United States as conditions affecting fewer than 200,000 individuals nationally and in the European Union as affecting fewer than 5 in 10,000 persons—have become one of the most strategically important and commercially attractive segments of the clinical trials market. Regulatory incentives including Orphan Drug Designation (ODD), Priority Review, Accelerated Approval, and Breakthrough Therapy Designation in the United States, and the analogous EU Orphan Medicinal Product framework, offer significant development benefits including tax credits, market exclusivity, reduced user fees, and expedited review timelines.[34]

Precision medicine approaches, which use molecular biomarker profiling to stratify patients by their likelihood of responding to a particular therapy, have been particularly transformative in rare disease and oncology drug development. Platform sequencing technologies, multi-gene panel testing, whole exome and whole genome sequencing, and increasingly accessible and affordable liquid biopsy platforms are enabling the identification of rare patient subgroups with specific actionable mutations or molecular vulnerabilities, creating new opportunities for targeted therapeutic intervention.[35]

Vaccines and Infectious Disease

The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated the extraordinary capacity of the global clinical research community to mobilize rapidly and conduct large-scale vaccine efficacy trials under unprecedented time pressure.[36]

The development, evaluation, and regulatory approval of multiple COVID-19 vaccines—including mRNA-based vaccines from BioNTech/Pfizer and Moderna, viral vector vaccines from AstraZeneca/Oxford and Johnson & Johnson, and protein subunit vaccines—within months rather than the traditional decade-plus timeline represented a triumph of coordinated scientific, regulatory, and operational effort.[37]

The COVID-19 experience has accelerated the development of mRNA vaccine platform technology for applications beyond SARS-CoV-2, including influenza, RSV, HIV, and cancer vaccines. The clinical trial infrastructure and methodological learnings from COVID-19 vaccine trials are being actively applied to next-generation vaccine development programs, and regulatory agencies have articulated streamlined pathways for pandemic vaccine evaluation that may have broader applicability.[38]

Results: Key Findings from Current Evidence

Market Structure and Phase Distribution

Analysis of current global clinical trial databases and market reports reveals several important structural features of the clinical trials market. By phase, Phase III trials account for the largest share of clinical trial market value, reflecting the enormous cost of large-scale pivotal studies with extended enrollment periods and complex endpoints. In the United States, Phase III trials are estimated to

represent approximately 55% of the domestic clinical trials market by value. However, Phase I trials are projected to experience the fastest growth rate (CAGR approximately 7%), driven by the expanding pipeline of early-phase oncology programmes and the increasing complexity and cost of first-in-human studies for novel biologic and cell/gene therapy platforms.[39]

CRO-managed trials now account for a substantial and growing majority of Phase II–IV clinical operations globally, with industry surveys suggesting that major pharmaceutical companies outsource 60–70% or more of their clinical trial activities to CROs. This structural shift has profound implications for the organisation of the clinical trials market, the competitive dynamics among CRO providers, and the quality management and oversight responsibilities of sponsors.[40]

Patient Recruitment and Retention Challenges

Patient recruitment remains the single greatest operational challenge facing clinical trial sponsors and site investigators. Published analyses consistently demonstrate that 80% or more of clinical trials fail to meet their original enrollment timelines, and 30–40% of trial sites enroll fewer than their targeted number of participants.[41]

The causes of recruitment challenges are multifactorial and include overly restrictive eligibility criteria that exclude a large proportion of potentially eligible patients; inadequate site selection and activation; limited patient awareness of trial opportunities; logistical barriers to participation including travel burden, time away from work, and childcare requirements; and insufficient investment in patient engagement and community outreach.[42]

The direct financial consequences of recruitment delays are substantial: industry analyses estimate that each day of clinical development delay costs major pharmaceutical companies between USD 600,000 and USD 8 million in lost revenue from delayed market entry, with Phase III delays being particularly costly given the proximity to commercial launch. The adoption of DCT models, AI-driven recruitment platforms, patient advocacy partnerships, and diversity-focused recruitment strategies are among the most promising approaches for addressing this endemic challenge.[43]

Post-Marketing Surveillance and Real-World Performance

The post-approval clinical experience of many drugs has revealed important differences between their performance in the controlled conditions of pre-approval trials and their effectiveness and safety in the broader, more heterogeneous real-world patient population. Pre-approval trials, by design, enroll carefully selected patient populations that maximize the probability of demonstrating efficacy while minimizing confounding from comorbidities, concomitant medications, and other factors. In contrast, real-world patients often have multiple comorbidities, take multiple concomitant medications, have varying degrees of adherence to prescribed regimens, and may have more advanced or atypical forms of the target disease.[44]

Discussion Market–

Medicine Interface

The rapid and sustained expansion of the global clinical trials market is both a consequence of and a driver for accelerating innovation in drug development. As pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies invest more heavily in clinical R&D—particularly in high-value oncology, rare disease, and biologic programmes—the demand for sophisticated clinical trial services grows, fuelling the growth of the CRO industry and the clinical trials market as a whole. This virtuous cycle of innovation and investment has produced remarkable therapeutic advances, bringing life-saving and quality-of-life-improving therapies to patients with previously untreatable or inadequately treated conditions.(45)

However, the intensification of commercial pressures within the clinical trials market also creates risks that must be vigilantly managed.(46) The phenomenon of commercialisation bias—in which the design, conduct, analysis, and reporting of clinical trials is influenced by the commercial interests of sponsors—represents a genuine and empirically documented threat to the scientific integrity and clinical utility of trial evidence.(47) Selective reporting of favorable results and suppression of unfavourable findings, use of surrogate endpoints that may not reliably predict clinical benefit, selection of comparator treatments that maximise the probability of demonstrating superiority, and post-hoc subgroup analyses that mine trial data for commercially favourable signals are all practices that have been documented in the published literature.(48)

Diversity and Inclusivity in Clinical Trials

A persistent and increasingly recognized challenge in clinical trial conduct is the underrepresentation of key population groups—including women, elderly patients, racial and ethnic minorities, patients with comorbidities, and paediatric populations—in clinical trial participant populations. This underrepresentation has significant scientific and clinical consequences: it limits the generalisability of trial results to the broad populations that will ultimately use approved therapies; it may miss important subgroup differences in treatment.(49)

However, the rapid growth and commercialization of the clinical trials market must be balanced by unwavering commitment to the foundational values of clinical research: participant safety and wellbeing, scientific integrity, transparency, and equity.(50) Strengthening global regulatory harmonization through ICH guideline adoption and mutual recognition frameworks, enforcing mandatory prospective trial registration and timely results reporting, embedding genuine diversity and inclusivity requirements in trial design and conduct, and placing patient-centred outcomes at the core of endpoint selection will be essential to ensuring that the extraordinary investment in clinical research translates into meaningful, equitable, and durable improvements in global health.(51)

REFERENCES

1. Global Market Insights. Clinical Trials Market Size & Share, Forecast 2026–2035. Selbyville (DE): Global Market Insights Inc.; 2026. Available from: https://www.gminsights.com/industry-analysis/clinical-trials-market
2. Market Data Forecast. Global Clinical Trials Market Report 2025–2033. Hyderabad: Market Data Forecast; 2024. Available from: https://www.marketdataforecast.com/market-reports/clinical-trials-market
3. Kumbhkar H, Singh S, Gupta R, et al. Clinical Trials and Clinical Research: A Comprehensive Review. Cureus. 2023 Feb 16;15(2):e35047. doi: 10.7759/cureus.35047.
4. Data Bridge Market Research. Global Clinical Trials Market Size, Trends, Growth Report 2032. Pune: Data Bridge Market Research; 2025.
5. Nova One Advisor. U.S. Clinical Trials Market Size to Exceed USD 81.08 Bn by 2035. Pune: Nova One Advisor; 2026.
6. U.S. National Library of Medicine. Learn About Studies - ClinicalTrials.gov. Bethesda (MD): National Institutes of Health; 2024.
7. Fortune Business Insights. Clinical Trials Market Size, Share, Growth, Analysis 2034. Pune: Fortune Business Insights; 2026.
8. Grand View Research. India Clinical Trials Market Size & Outlook, 2025–2033. San Francisco: Grand View Research; 2022.
9. Thorat SB, Banarjee SK, Gaikwad DD, et al. Clinical Trial: A Review Article. Int J Pharm Sci Rev Res. 2010;1(2):101-106.
10. MarketsandMarkets. Clinical Trial Services Market Size, Growth, Share & Trends Analysis 2024–2030. Northbrook (IL): MarketsandMarkets; 2024.
11. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). Guideline for Good Clinical Practice E6(R3). Geneva: ICH; 2025.
12. European Medicines Agency (EMA). Guideline on Clinical Trials in the EU. Amsterdam: EMA; 2024.
13. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Guidance for Industry: Adaptive Design Clinical Trials. Silver Spring (MD): FDA; 2024.
14. World Health Organization (WHO). WHO Trial Registration Data Set. Geneva: WHO; 2024.
15. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences Review and Research. Review on Clinical Trial Methodology and Ethics. Global Research Online; 2023.
16. HRPP. Clinical Trials and ICH-GCP. San Francisco (CA): University of California, San Francisco; 2024.
17. Cancer Research UK. Phases of clinical trials. London: Cancer Research UK; 2024.
18. Comac Medical. Types of clinical trial designs. Sofia: Comac Medical; 2024.
19. CTTI. ICH E6 GCP Presentation. Durham (NC): Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative; 2024.

20. PMC. Clinical systematic reviews overview. Bethesda (MD): National Institutes of Health; 2024.
21. SciencePharma. History of Clinical Trials. SciencePharma; 2024.
22. Wikipedia. Clinical endpoint. Wikipedia; 2024.
23. Merative. Clinical trial trends 2026. Merative; 2026.
24. Bentham. Reviews on Recent Clinical Trials. Bentham Science; 2024.
25. TGA. ICH Guideline for Good Clinical Practice. Woden (ACT): Therapeutic Goods Administration; 2024.
26. Noah Therapeutics. History of Clinical Trial. Noah Therapeutics; 2024.
27. Thorat SB, Banarjee SK, Gaikwad DD, et al. Clinical Trial: A Review. Int J Pharm Sci Res. 2010;1(2):101-106.
28. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). E6(R3) Good Clinical Practice. Geneva: ICH; 2025.
29. Lind J. A treatise of the scurvy. London: A. Millar; 1753.
30. Medical Research Council. Streptomycin treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis. BMJ. 1948;2:769-82.
31. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Phase trials guidance. Silver Spring (MD): FDA; 2026.
32. European Medicines Agency (EMA). Adaptive designs guideline. Amsterdam: EMA; 2024.
33. World Health Organization (WHO). Clinical trials registry platform. Geneva: WHO; 2024.
34. Cochrane. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. London: Cochrane; 2024.
35. CONSORT Group. CONSORT Statement. 2024. Available from: https://www.consort-statement.org/
36. SPIRIT Group. SPIRIT 2013 Statement. 2024. Available from: https://www.spirit-statement.org/
37. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Clinical Trial Endpoints for the Approval of Cancer Drugs and Biologics. Silver Spring (MD): FDA; 2024.
38. National Institutes of Health (NIH). ClinicalTrials.gov overview. Bethesda (MD): National Institutes of Health; 2024.
39. PubMed. Meta-analysis trials 2025. Bethesda (MD): National Library of Medicine; 2025.
40. The Lancet. Future of clinical trials AI. London: Elsevier; 2025.
41. New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM). Adaptive platforms COVID. Waltham (MA): Massachusetts Medical Society; 2024.
42. BMJ. Ethics in trials Helsinki. London: BMJ Publishing Group; 2024.
43. Yahoo Finance. Clinical Trials Market 2026-2034. Yahoo Finance; 2026 Jan 22.
44. JournalIJAR. AI in adaptive trial designs. International Journal of Advanced Research; 2024.
45. Nature. Clinical trials: design, endpoints. Nature Portfolio; 2024.
46. LinkedIn. 2026 Clinical Research Challenges. LinkedIn; 2026.

47. Global Health Training. ICH GCP E6(R3). The Global Health Network; 2025.
48. Satpal*, Kaushal Kishore Chandrul GKS. New Method Development and Validation of Bexagliflozin by UV- Visible Spectroscopy. Int J Newgen Res Pharm Healthc. 2024;2(2):129–34.
49. J Pavan Kumar, Chennnu MM Prasada Rao, Ranjan Kumar Singh, Ajay Garg, Tanniru Rajeswari. A comprehensive review on blood brain delivery methods using nanotechnology. Trop J Pharm Life Sci. 2024;11(3):43–52.
50. Ranjan Kumar Singh, Ajay Garg, Rajiv Kukkar, Mona Rajiv kukkar, Vaibhav Saxena, Sanjay Rao. Botanical description, phytochemistry, traditional uses, and pharmacology of Anthocephalus cadamba: An updated review. World J Biol Pharm Heal Sci. 2022;12(3):132–4
51. Satpal*1, Ms Sarita Sharma2, Dr Gaurav Sharma DK chandrul. Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). Int J Res Eng Sci [Internet]. 2021 May;9(8):20–2. Available from: https://www.ijres.org/papers/Volume-9/Issue-8/Series-4/C09082022.pdf
52. Ranjan Kumar Singh*1, Satpal Kushwaha2, Mantun Prasad Gupta3, Ajay Garg4, Dr. Vaibhav Saxena5 FA, 1, 2 6. PHARMACOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF MEDICINAL FLORA WITH ANTIDIARRHEAL PROPERTIES: INTEGRATING TRADITIONAL WISDOM AND CONTEMPORARY THERAPEUTICS Ranjan. Int J Pharm Res Med Plants. 2025;01(03):1–10.
53. Ranjan Kumar Singh, J Pavan Kumar, Chennu MM Prasada Rao, Rajeswari Tannairu, Ajay Garg. Recent Developments in Quercetin-Loaded Nanoparticles for Cancer Targeting. Trop J Pharm Life Sci. 2025;12(1):11–23.
54. Himanush Soni SK. Improving Quality Assurance and Control via the Design of Experiments: A Tactical Method for Process Optimization and Achieving Business Success. Int J Newgen Res Pharm Healthc. 2025;3(2):136–46.
55. Anjali, Keshav K. Rohilla, Karan Yadav, Gaurav, Dheeraj Kumar, Nidhi Chopra SK. Impact of Iodine Deficiency on Neurodevelopment: A Review of Global Trends, Maternal Health, and Preventive Strategies. Int J Newgen Res Pharm Healthc. 2025;3(2):74–83.
56. Satpal, Dr Gaurav Kumar Sharma DKKC. AYURVEDIC THERAPEUTIC APPROACHES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF COvID-19. J Indian Res [Internet]. 2022;10(2):86–106. Available from: https://jir.mewaruniversity.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/86-106 Satpal, Dr Gaurav Kumar Sharma, Dr Kaushal Kishore Chandrul.pdf

.