American Journal of Current Science Research and Reviews
ISSN: - applied

Multidimensional Real World Evidence Frameworks in Regulatory Science and Health Technology Decision Making

[1] Victor Pavel Dimitrov
[1] University of Sao Paulo, Brazil

Received: 19th Oct 2025 | Received Revised Version: 11th Nov 2025 | Accepted: 30th Nov 2025 | Published: 07th Dec 2025

Volume 01 Issue 02 2025 | Crossref DOI: 10.64917/ajcsrr/V01I02-002

Abstract

Real world evidence has emerged as a transformative force in modern regulatory science, clinical pharmacology, health technology assessment, and patient centered drug development. As healthcare systems increasingly rely on data generated outside controlled clinical trials, regulators, payers, clinicians, and patients are confronted with both unprecedented opportunities and complex methodological challenges. This article presents a comprehensive theoretical and methodological synthesis of real world evidence generation and use, grounded strictly in the authoritative academic and policy literature that has shaped this field over the last decade. Drawing on foundational regulatory science frameworks, international best practice guidance, and evolving governance models, this work develops an integrated understanding of how real world data can be translated into scientifically credible and ethically responsible evidence for regulatory and health system decision making.

The paper situates real world evidence within the broader evolution of regulatory decision making, showing how traditional randomized controlled trials, while foundational, are increasingly insufficient to address the complexity, heterogeneity, and speed required in modern healthcare. Regulatory authorities such as the Food and Drug Administration and the European Medicines Agency have progressively embraced multidimensional evidence generation approaches that combine clinical trial data with observational data from registries, electronic health records, claims databases, and patient reported outcomes, as described by Jarow et al. 2017 and Liu et al. 2019. These developments are further reinforced by legislative reforms such as the Twenty First Century Cures Act, which explicitly encourages the use of real world evidence to support regulatory decisions and post market evaluation as explained by Gabay 2017.

This article advances a conceptual model that integrates regulatory science, patient focused drug development, and data governance into a unified analytical framework. It draws on patient engagement principles articulated by Perfetto et al. 2015 to show how real world evidence must not only satisfy methodological rigor but also reflect patient experiences, preferences, and outcomes. At the same time, it incorporates data governance and transparency principles developed by Cole et al. 2015, Berger et al. 2017, and the Equator Network 2024 to ensure that real world evidence is credible, reproducible, and fit for regulatory and health technology assessment purposes.

Methodologically, the article employs an interpretive qualitative synthesis of the provided references, using logic modeling approaches described by Frechtling 2007 and Van Koperen et al. 2013 to map the pathways through which real world data are transformed into regulatory grade evidence. This approach allows the identification of causal mechanisms, institutional incentives, and methodological constraints that shape the effectiveness of real world evidence in practice. Particular attention is given to trial designs using real world data, as elaborated by Baumfeld Andre et al. 2020, and to the integration of multiple data sources for health technology assessment as described by Graili et al. 2023.

Keywords: Real world evidence, Regulatory science, Patient focused drug development, Health technology assessment, Data governance, Clinical pharmacology.

Cite This Article: Victor Pavel Dimitrov. 2025. Multidimensional Real World Evidence Frameworks in Regulatory Science and Health Technology Decision Making. American Journal of Current Science Research and Reviews 1, 02, 7-12. https://doi.org/10.64917/ajcsrr/V01I02-002

1. Introduction

The transformation of modern healthcare systems is inseparable from the transformation of the evidence that guides clinical, regulatory, and policy decisions. For much of the twentieth century, randomized controlled trials were treated as the uncontested gold standard for establishing the safety and efficacy of medical products. While their methodological rigor remains essential, it has become increasingly clear that controlled trials alone cannot fully capture the complexity of real world clinical practice, patient heterogeneity, long term outcomes, and system level effects. This recognition has led to the emergence of real world data and real world evidence as central pillars of contemporary regulatory science and health technology assessment, as described by Jarow et al. 2017 and Liu et al. 2019.

Real world data refer to data relating to patient health status or the delivery of healthcare that are routinely collected from sources such as electronic health records, claims and billing systems, product and disease registries, digital health technologies, and patient reported outcomes. When these data are systematically analyzed to generate insights about the use, benefits, and risks of medical products, they become real world evidence. This shift from narrowly controlled experimental environments to broader observational ecosystems reflects deeper changes in how medicine, society, and governance interact. Suvarna 2018 emphasizes that this transition is not merely technical but epistemological, requiring a rethinking of what counts as valid and actionable evidence.

Regulatory agencies have played a central role in legitimizing and structuring this transition. The United States Food and Drug Administration, as discussed by Jarow et al. 2017, has articulated a multidimensional evidence generation framework in which data from clinical trials, real world sources, and mechanistic studies are integrated to support regulatory decisions. Similarly, the European Medicines Agency has developed detailed guidance on registry based studies and the use of observational data for regulatory purposes, reflecting a broader global convergence toward hybrid evidence models as documented by European Medicines Agency 2021.

These developments are driven by practical and ethical imperatives. Rare diseases, precision medicine, and rapidly evolving therapeutic areas such as oncology and gene therapy often lack the patient populations or ethical feasibility required for large randomized trials. Rath et al. 2017 show that in rare diseases, evidence gaps and methodological barriers severely limit the ability of traditional trial designs to generate timely and relevant knowledge. In such contexts, real world evidence becomes not a secondary option but a primary pathway for understanding treatment effects and informing regulatory and clinical decisions. Miksad et al. 2019 further demonstrate how small, highly specific patient populations in precision medicine rely on real world data to generate meaningful insights that would otherwise be unattainable.

At the same time, the expansion of real world evidence raises profound challenges related to data quality, bias, transparency, and governance. Cole et al. 2015 highlight that without robust data governance arrangements, real world evidence risks becoming fragmented, unreliable, and vulnerable to misuse. Berger et al. 2017 stress the need for good practices in study design, data collection, and reporting to ensure that observational research meets the standards required for healthcare decision making. These concerns are echoed by Elliott et al. 2015, who argue that the proliferation of diverse health data sources demands new science of data synthesis capable of integrating heterogeneous forms of evidence into coherent and credible conclusions.

Despite the rapid growth of real world evidence, significant literature gaps remain. Much of the existing research focuses either on technical methods or on isolated policy initiatives, without fully integrating regulatory science, patient centered approaches, and governance frameworks into a unified theoretical model. Furthermore, while countries such as China have developed large scale real world data infrastructures, as described by Sun et al. 2018, comparative analyses of how different regulatory cultures and institutional arrangements shape the use of real world evidence are still limited. The purpose of this article is therefore to provide a comprehensive and theoretically grounded synthesis of real world evidence in regulatory decision making, drawing exclusively on the provided references to ensure academic rigor and conceptual coherence.

2. Methodology

The methodological approach adopted in this study is an interpretive qualitative synthesis of the provided academic and policy literature. This approach is particularly appropriate for complex, multidimensional fields such as real world evidence, where the goal is not to aggregate numerical outcomes but to understand how concepts, institutions, and practices interact to produce regulatory knowledge. Elliott et al. 2015 emphasize that making sense of health data requires a science of synthesis capable of integrating diverse forms of evidence, and this principle guides the present analysis.

The first step involved a systematic reading of all provided references to identify their core conceptual contributions, methodological assumptions, and normative positions regarding real world evidence. Jarow et al. 2017 and Liu et al. 2019 were treated as foundational regulatory science texts, offering insight into how regulatory agencies conceptualize multidimensional evidence. Perfetto et al. 2015 provided the patient focused drug development perspective, while Berger et al. 2017 and Berger et al. 2017 in Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety articulated methodological standards for real world data studies. Cole et al. 2015 and the Duke Margolis Center for Health Policy 2017 contributed governance and policy frameworks, and European Medicines Agency 2021 supplied regulatory guidance on registry based studies. Graili et al. 2023 offered an up to date perspective on integrating multiple data sources in health technology assessment.

To structure the synthesis, logic modeling methods described by Frechtling 2007 and Van Koperen et al. 2013 were applied. Logic models are conceptual tools that map the relationships between inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes in complex systems. In this context, inputs include data sources, regulatory mandates, and patient engagement mechanisms; activities include data collection, analysis, and regulatory review; outputs include regulatory decisions and health technology assessments; and outcomes include patient access, safety, and system level efficiency. By mapping these relationships, it becomes possible to identify leverage points, bottlenecks, and sources of bias in the real world evidence ecosystem.

The analysis also draws on comparative regulatory and governance theory, particularly the institutional decision making frameworks discussed by Thomson et al. 2006. Although their work focuses on the European Union, its insights into how collective decisions are shaped by institutional rules, stakeholder preferences, and information flows are directly relevant to understanding how real world evidence is interpreted and acted upon by regulatory bodies.

Throughout the synthesis, particular attention is paid to the principles of transparency, reproducibility, and ethical accountability articulated by the Equator Network 2024. These principles serve as normative benchmarks against which the practices described in the literature are evaluated. The goal is not to rank or score individual studies but to develop a coherent theoretical model that explains how real world evidence can be generated and used in ways that are scientifically credible and socially legitimate.

3. Results

The synthesis of the literature reveals several interrelated findings about the role of real world evidence in regulatory science and health technology decision making. First, there is a clear consensus that real world evidence is no longer peripheral but central to contemporary regulatory practice. Jarow et al. 2017 describe how the Food and Drug Administration has moved toward a multidimensional evidence generation framework in which real world data are systematically incorporated into both premarket and postmarket decisions. This shift is driven by the recognition that traditional clinical trials, while internally valid, often lack external validity and cannot capture long term safety, rare adverse events, or real world patterns of use.

Liu et al. 2019 further elaborate that from a clinical pharmacology perspective, real world data provide critical insights into how drugs behave in diverse patient populations, under conditions of polypharmacy, comorbidity, and variable adherence. These insights are essential for understanding benefit risk profiles in ways that are meaningful for everyday clinical practice. The result is a regulatory paradigm in which evidence is not static but continuously updated as new data emerge from routine care.

Second, the literature demonstrates that patient focused drug development is both a driver and a beneficiary of real world evidence. Perfetto et al. 2015 show that patient engagement initiatives have pushed regulators and sponsors to value outcomes that matter to patients, such as quality of life, functional status, and symptom burden. Real world data sources, particularly patient reported outcomes and digital health technologies, are uniquely suited to capturing these dimensions of treatment effect. As a result, real world evidence serves as a bridge between clinical efficacy and lived experience.

Third, governance and methodological standards emerge as decisive factors in determining whether real world evidence is trusted and used in regulatory decisions. Cole et al. 2015 identify a wide range of data governance arrangements,

from centralized national registries to fragmented private databases, each with different implications for data quality, access, and accountability. Berger et al. 2017 emphasize that without rigorous study design, transparency, and reporting, real world data analyses risk producing misleading or biased results. The Equator Network 2024 reinforces this by promoting standardized reporting guidelines that enhance reproducibility and credibility.

Fourth, the integration of multiple data sources is both a major opportunity and a major challenge. Graili et al. 2023 show that combining data from registries, claims, electronic health records, and other sources can provide a more comprehensive picture of treatment effects, but only if issues of interoperability, data harmonization, and methodological consistency are addressed. Baumfeld Andre et al. 2020 further demonstrate that innovative trial designs using real world data, such as pragmatic trials and hybrid observational experimental models, are reshaping the regulatory approval process by blurring the boundary between research and practice.

Finally, international experience highlights both the scalability and the variability of real world evidence systems. Sun et al. 2018 describe how China has leveraged its large population and digital health infrastructure to generate vast amounts of real world data, enabling rapid learning about treatment patterns and outcomes. At the same time, Thomson et al. 2006 remind us that regulatory decisions are embedded in political and institutional contexts that shape how evidence is interpreted and acted upon. This means that real world evidence does not have a single global meaning but is mediated by local governance structures and policy priorities.

4. Discussion

The findings of this synthesis have profound implications for how regulatory science, health technology assessment, and patient centered care are conceptualized and practiced. At a theoretical level, the rise of real world evidence represents a shift from a linear, trial centric model of knowledge production to a dynamic, networked model in which multiple data streams continuously inform decision making. Jarow et al. 2017 conceptualize this as multidimensional evidence generation, a framework that recognizes the complementary strengths and limitations of different data sources.

This shift challenges traditional hierarchies of evidence, which privileged randomized controlled trials above all other forms of data. While such hierarchies were developed to protect against bias and confounding, they are increasingly ill suited to the complexity of modern medicine. Suvarna 2018 argues that the question is no longer whether real world evidence is ready, but whether regulatory systems are ready to use it responsibly. This requires new forms of methodological rigor that are adapted to observational data rather than imported uncritically from experimental paradigms.

Patient focused drug development further complicates and enriches this picture. Perfetto et al. 2015 show that when patients are engaged as partners in evidence generation, the definition of meaningful outcomes expands beyond traditional clinical endpoints. Real world evidence, particularly from patient reported outcomes and digital monitoring, becomes a crucial tool for capturing these broader dimensions of value. However, this also raises ethical and epistemic questions about whose voices are represented in data and how subjective experiences are translated into regulatory knowledge.

Governance is therefore not a peripheral issue but a core determinant of the legitimacy of real world evidence. Cole et al. 2015 and the Duke Margolis Center for Health Policy 2017 emphasize that clear rules about data ownership, access, privacy, and accountability are essential for building trust among stakeholders. Without such rules, the same data that promise to democratize evidence can instead exacerbate power imbalances and commercial exploitation.

Methodological challenges remain substantial. Berger et al. 2017 caution that observational studies are inherently vulnerable to confounding, selection bias, and measurement error. While advanced statistical methods and careful study design can mitigate these risks, they cannot eliminate them entirely. This is why transparency and reproducibility, as promoted by the Equator Network 2024, are so critical. When methods and data sources are openly reported, independent researchers and regulators can assess the robustness of findings and identify potential sources of bias.

The integration of multiple data sources, as discussed by Graili et al. 2023, offers a way to triangulate evidence and enhance validity. However, it also introduces new complexities related to data harmonization, variable definitions, and missing information. These technical challenges are inseparable from organizational and political ones, as different stakeholders control different data assets and have different incentives for sharing or withholding information.

International experiences such as those described by Sun et

al. 2018 demonstrate that large scale real world data systems can be built and used for policy and regulatory purposes, but they also highlight the importance of context. Regulatory cultures, legal frameworks, and public trust all shape how real world evidence is generated and used. Thomson et al. 2006 remind us that evidence does not speak for itself but is interpreted through institutional processes that reflect broader social values and power relations.

5. Conclusion

This article has provided a comprehensive and theoretically grounded analysis of real world evidence in regulatory science and health technology decision making, drawing exclusively on the provided academic and policy literature. The synthesis demonstrates that real world evidence is not simply an add on to traditional clinical trials but a foundational component of a new multidimensional evidence ecosystem. When governed by robust standards of transparency, methodological rigor, and patient engagement, real world evidence has the potential to make regulatory decisions more responsive, inclusive, and scientifically grounded.

At the same time, the analysis highlights that this potential will only be realized if persistent challenges related to data quality, bias, governance, and institutional trust are addressed. The future of regulatory science lies not in choosing between trials and real world data, but in developing integrated frameworks that leverage the strengths of both. As healthcare systems continue to generate ever larger and more complex data streams, the principles articulated by Jarow et al. 2017, Berger et al. 2017, and the Equator Network 2024 will be essential for ensuring that this information is transformed into knowledge that serves patients and society.

References

1. Baumfeld Andre E, Reynolds R, Caubel P, Azoulay L, Dreyer NA. Trial designs using real world data the changing landscape of the regulatory approval process. Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety. 2020;29:1201 to 1212. doi 10.1002/pds.4932
2. Berger ML, Sox H, Willke RJ, Brixner DL, Eichler HG, Goettsch W, et al. Good practices for real world data studies of treatment and or comparative effectiveness recommendations from the joint ISPOR ISPE special task force on real world evidence in health care decision making. Value in Health. 2017;20:1003 to 1008. doi 10.1016 j.jval.2017.08.3019
3. Berger ML, Sox H, Willke RJ, Brixner DL, Eichler HG, Goettsch W, et al. Good practices for real world data studies of treatment and or comparative effectiveness recommendations from the joint ISPOR ISPE special task force on real world evidence in health care decision making. Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety. 2017;26:1033 to 1039. doi 10.1002 pds.4297
4. Cole A, Garrison L, Mestre Ferrandiz J, Towse A. Data Governance Arrangements for Real World Evidence. Office of Health Economics. London. 2015
5. Duke Margolis Center for Health Policy. A framework for regulatory use of real world evidence. 2017
6. Elliott JH, Grimshaw J, Altman R, Bero L, Goodman SN, Henry D, et al. Make sense of health data develop the science of data synthesis to join up the myriad varieties of health information. Nature. 2015;527:31 to 32. doi 10.1038 527031a
7. Equator Network. Enhancing the quality and transparency of health research. 2024
8. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on registry based studies. 2021
9. Frechtling JA. Logic Modeling Methods in Program Evaluation. John Wiley and Sons. New York. 2007
10. Gabay M. Twenty first century cures act. Hospital Pharmacy. 2017;52:264. doi 10.1310 hpj5204 26
11. Graili P, Guertin JR, Chan KKW, Tadrous M. Integration of real world evidence from different data sources in health technology assessment. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2023;26:11460. doi 10.3389 jpps.2023.11460
12. Jarow JP, LaVange L, Woodcock J. Multidimensional evidence generation and FDA regulatory decision making defining and using real world data. JAMA. 2017;318:703 to 704. doi 10.1001 jama.2017.9991
13. Liu Q, Ramamoorthy A, Huang SM. Real world data and clinical pharmacology a regulatory science perspective. Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics. 2019;106:67 to 71. doi 10.1002 cpt.1413
14. Miksad RA, Samant MK, Sarkar S, Abernethy AP. Small but mighty the use of real world evidence to inform precision medicine. Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics. 2019;106:87 to 90. doi 10.1002 cpt.1466
15. Perfetto EM, Oehrlein EM, Anyanwu C, Burcu M, Gaitonde P, Hanna ML, et al. Maryland Center of Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation Conference 2015 Patient Focused Drug Development. University of Maryland Baltimore. 2015
16. Rath A, Salamon V, Peixoto S, Hivert V, Laville M,

Segrestin B, et al. A systematic literature review of evidence based clinical practice for rare diseases what are the perceived and real barriers for improving the evidence and how can they be overcome. Trials. 2017;18:556. doi 10.1186 s13063 017 2287 7

17. Sun X, Tan J, Tang L, Guo JJ, Li X. Real world evidence experience and lessons from China. BMJ. 2018;360:j5262. doi 10.1136 bmj.j5262

18. Suvarna VR. Real world evidence are we ready. Perspectives in Clinical Research. 2018;9:61. doi 10.4103 picr.PICR 36 18

19. Thomson R, Stokman FN, Achen CH, Konig T. The European Union Decides. Cambridge University Press. 2006

20. Van Koperen T, Jebb S, Summerbell C, Visscher T, Romon M, Borys JM, et al. Characterizing the EPODE logic model unravelling the past and informing the future. Obesity Reviews. 2013;14:162 to 170. doi 10.1111 j.1467 789X.2012.01057.x