Case Study: Safety Narratives

Project Scope

Customer: Mid-size, public biotech company

Scenario: 56 Patient Narratives for an open-label Phase 1/2 Oncology study were previously written by the customer in house

Ask: Author Draft 1 patient narratives using Peer AI platform for comparison on efficiency, quality, and overall burden.

Methodology:

- 1st drafts of all 56 Patient Narratives were authored using Peer AI platform (100% generated by Generative AI)
- The exact same data files were used for manual and Peer authoring.
- Source data included: Tables, Figures and Listings, Patient Profiles, Medwatch forms.
- Tracked medical writing hours involved for generation using technology
- Independent reviewers/writers graded Peer-generated 1st draft narratives versus customer-generated final narratives on 1-5 scale across accuracy, completeness and readability
- Metrics were compared to evaluation and actuals for customer's original project

Results

Quality: Quality **better** than traditional methodology
(Peer draft 1 compared to Customer final draft)

- **Accuracy:** Comparable (Peer 1% Higher)
- **Completeness:** Comparable (Peer 1% Higher)
- **Readability:** Significantly Higher (Peer 7% Higher)
- Customer assessment that level of quality would have **decreased review time** to final draft.

Efficiency: Peer AI platform was **17x more efficient** than traditional methodology in completing scope of 56 narratives

	Traditional	Peer AI Platform
56 Narratives Total medical writer hours to 1st Draft	336 Hours	16 Hours (+4 hours by LLM)
56 Narratives Per Narrative Time	6 Hours	21 Minutes (0.36 Hours)

Overall Burden: Customer burden reduced. Peer AI platform was **configured in 74 hours**, off the critical path and by Peer team. Used the same data files used by human medical writers. Output delivered in docx to flow seamlessly into existing QC review workflow.