



## Supplementary Materials for

### **Sponsors meet scientists to speed pediatric medicines development**

Jonathan M. Davis,\* William E. Smoyer, Edward M. Connor, W. Charles Huskins, Cindy Pastern, Mary Purucker, Elisabeth C. Schrader, Cynthia R. Jackson, Frederick J. Kaskel, Steven Hirschfeld

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: [jdavis@tuftsmedicalcenter.org](mailto:jdavis@tuftsmedicalcenter.org)

Published 18 March 2015, *Sci. Transl. Med.* **7**, 279fs11(2015)  
DOI: 10.1126/scitranslmed.aaa2045

#### **This PDF file includes:**

Table S1. Protocol synopsis.

Table S2. REDCap survey questions.

Table S3. Studies involving specific disease processes.

**Table S1. Protocol synopsis.** Potential sponsors submitted a protocol summary that contained the following information (sponsors could redact the name of the drug to be studied):

Title
Study population
Rationale (drug/device may be de-identified)
Study objectives (including any regulatory requirements)
Inclusion/exclusion criteria
Overview study design
Number of patients to be enrolled
How long will the study run?

**Table S2. REDCap survey questions.**

How was the point person selected at your institution?
Who appointed the point person?
Did the point person participate in the teleconferences during which protocols were discussed?
What is the professional category of the Point Person at your institution?
Did the point person at your institution have protected time or salary support for work on the point person project?
Did the point person at your institution have assistance from other research professionals for work on the point person project?
Did the point person at your institution have support from an administrative assistant for work on the Point Person Project?
Who disseminated Point Person Project protocols to prospective investigators at your institution?
How were protocols disseminated to prospective investigators at your institution?
To whom were Point Person Project protocols disseminated?
Did the point person directly contact individual investigators?
Did the point person receive feedback about the response of prospective investigators to Point Person Project protocols?
Did the point person receive feedback about the participation of the institution in Point Person Project protocols?
What were the benefits of implementing the Point Person Project at your institution?
What were the challenges in implementing the Point Person Project at your institution?
How could the implementation of the Point Person Project be improved at your institution or in general?

**Table S3. Studies involving specific disease processes.** From April 2012 to March 2013, 24 protocols were submitted; 16 (67%) by a single CRO (representing a number of commercial sponsors), 6 from individual industry sponsors (25%), and 2 from individual investigators (8%).

Neurologic conditions (migraine headaches)
Psychiatric illness (depression, schizophrenia, autism)
Diabetes
Infectious diseases
Immunizations
Pain (orthopedic injuries, post-operative)
Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia
Childhood cancer (melanoma)
Hypertension
Sickle cell disease
Thrombosis and clotting disorders
Crohn's disease
Pulmonary disorders (plastic bronchitis)