INDUSTRY EVOLUTION • 2025

The Evolution of Health Research

Bridging the Gap Between Innovation and Scientific Evidence

Introduction

In the last decade, the commercial health industry has seen explosive growth, driven by an increasing demand for alternative, personalized solutions to health. Unfortunately, the scientific rigor behind many of these products has not kept pace with their innovation. Historically, non-medical health research has struggled to meet the gold standard of scientific evidence required for widespread adoption and trust among consumers and healthcare providers. The purpose of this paper is to explore the historical landscape of commercial health research, highlighting its limitations, and proposing a new model that leverages advances in technology and available resources to elevate the quality and credibility of health-based research.

The Landscape of Commercial Health Research

The landscape of commercial health research has evolved significantly over the years in an effort to keep up with advancements in product development, scientific methodologies, and regulatory frameworks. Historically, health research has been predominantly run by academic

institutions and contract research organizations (CROs), with a strong focus on traditional research methodologies like randomized controlled trials (RCTs). These trials have been considered the gold standard for generating reliable data due to their structured approach and ability to minimize bias through control.

Despite their strengths, traditional RCTs have limitations, particularly regarding cost, time, and applicability to real-world settings. The meticulous design and implementation required for these trials often result in high costs and extended timelines, making them less accessible to smaller companies, especially those developing niche products. Moreover, the controlled environments of RCTs may not accurately reflect real-world conditions, posing challenges for innovative health solutions.

In more recent years, the landscape has been reshaped by the rise of health-related technologies and the increasing demand for evidence-based validation of health products. Organizations now face a critical need to demonstrate efficacy and differentiate their products through validated claims. However, the cost and time constraints of traditional research approaches often inhibit these efforts.

The integration of real-world evidence (RWE) into the health research landscape marks one significant shift. Although the adoption of RWE has been gradual, it offers a promising opportunity for commercial health entities to conduct scientifically rigorous research in a more realistic and cost-effective manner. By leveraging data from electronic health records, wearable technology, and patient registries, researchers can gain insights into the effectiveness of interventions across diverse populations and settings.

Despite these advancements, challenges persist. For small organizations, utilizing RWE to demonstrate the efficacy of their product is neither clear-cut nor simple. As such, many commercial health studies still rely on population norms, self-reported data, or limited sample sizes, leading to biased or inconclusive results. As observed historically, these approaches fail to address the existing gap between the marketing claims made by health companies and producing the scientific evidence needed to substantiate those claims. As the field continues to evolve, there is a pressing need for innovative research methodologies that incorporate scientific rigor with practical applicability, ensuring that commercial health products are both effective and trustworthy.

Current Shortcomings of Traditional Research Methods in Commercial Health Research

Despite some shifts in the standard of health research, overall research practices have been slow to adapt and utilize modern advancements to adequately serve commercial entities. The reliance on outdated methodologies limits their ability to fully capture the impact of new health products. Key challenges include:

Key Challenges:

1. Lack of Real-World Relevance: Traditional research conducted in controlled environments that do not accurately reflect real-world conditions. This limits the generalizability of the findings to broader populations.

2. High Costs and Time Constraints: RCTs are expensive and time-consuming, often taking years to complete. This is impractical for companies looking to rapidly innovate and bring new products to market.

3. Limited Personalization: Traditional research methods do not account for individual variability in response to health interventions, leading to one-size-fits-all recommendations that may not be effective for everyone.

4. Over Reliance on Self-Reported Data: Many studies rely on subjective self-reported data, which is prone to bias and inaccuracies.

Traditional research methods in commercial health settings have consistently fallen short in addressing the dynamic needs of modern health product development. The limitations in real-world applicability, high costs, time constraints, lack of personalization, and reliance on subjective data highlight the urgent need for innovative approaches that better align with the realities of today's healthcare landscape.

A New Model for Commercial Health Research

At the forefront of addressing these challenges is a need for a real-world, multifaceted, multifunctional, and personalized approach to health research. With the rise of health-based

and artificial technologies, there is now an opportunity to access data that was previously unavailable. This shift necessitates a reevaluation of traditional research methodologies to reduce cost and time constraints, making comprehensive commercial research more feasible and efficient.

To overcome existing obstacles, the integration of RWE is essential. Continuous monitoring of health and biomarker data allows researchers to incorporate objective, real-world evidence into research models at the participant level, providing a more comprehensive understanding of how interventions perform across diverse populations and settings. This approach not only enhances the relevance and applicability of research findings, but also reduces the time and cost associated with traditional trials.

Additionally, the adoption of adaptive trial designs and digital health platforms can further streamline the research process. Adaptive trials allow for modifications to be made as data is collected, enabling more efficient resource allocation and faster decision-making. Digital health platforms facilitate remote monitoring and data collection, reducing the need for in-person visits, expanding access to a broader participant pool, and reducing necessary external resources.

Effectively integrating these innovative methodologies requires collaboration between industry stakeholders, regulatory bodies, and technology developers to establish standards and best practices. By developing a model that supports the integration of new technologies and data sources, the health industry can achieve a more sustainable and effective approach to conducting research. This transformation is crucial for ensuring that commercial health research remains viable, enabling the development of impactful health solutions that meet the needs of this rapidly growing industry.

Conclusion

As the health and wellness market becomes increasingly more saturated, the need for credible, scientifically validated products is more important than ever. The time has come to evolve beyond traditional research methods and embrace a new paradigm that leverages the power of technology and good clinical practice to validate innovative health products. This approach not only strengthens the claims made by health companies but also ensures that their products truly deliver on their promises, differentiating them in a crowded market.

References

1. Singhal, S. and Ungerman, D. (2023) Healthcare's next chapter: What's ahead for the US healthcare industry. McKinsey.

2. Kroeger, C.M., Garza, C., Lynch, C.J., Myers, E., Rowe, S., Schneeman, B.O., Sharma, A.M., and Allison, D.B. (2018). Scientific rigor and credibility in the nutrition research landscape. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 107(3), 484-494.

3. Gomis-Pastor, M., Berdun, J., Borras-Santos, A., et al. (2024). Clinical validation of digital healthcare solutions: State of the art, challenges, and opportunities. Healthcare (Basel), 12(11), 1057.

4. Allison, K.R and Rootman, I. (1996). Scientific rigor and community participation in health promotion research: are they compatible? Health Promotion International, 11(4), 333-340.

5. Bhatt, A. (2010). Evolution of clinical research: A history before and beyond James Lind. Perspectives in Clinical Research, 1(1), 6-10.

6. IQVIA. (2019). The changing landscape of research and development. IQVIA.

7. Sherman, R.E., Anderson, S.A., Dal Pan, M.P.P., et al. (2016). Real-world evidence - What is it and what can it tell us? NEJM, 375(23), 2293-2297.

8. Dang, A. (2023). Real-world evidence: A primer. Pharmaceutical Medicine, 37(1), 25-36.

9. Motahari-Nezhad, H., Fgaier, M., Abid, M.M., et al. (2022). Digital biomarker-based studies: Scoping review of systematic reviews. JMIR mHealth and uHealth, 10(10), e35722.

10. Piwek, L., Ellis, D. A., Andrews, S., & Joinson, A. (2016). The rise of consumer health wearables: Promises and barriers. PLoS Medicine, 13(2), e1001953.

11. Pallmann, P., Bedding, A.W., Choodari-Oskooei, B. et al. (2018). Adaptive designs in clinical trials: Why use them, and how to run and report them. BMC Med 16, 29.

12. Peyser, N.D., Marcus, G.M., Beatty, A.L., et al. (2022). Digital platforms for clinical trials: The Eureka experience. Contemporary Clinical Trials, 115.