Improving quality of preclinical academic research through auditing: A feasibility study

Claudia Kurreck¹, Esmeralda Castaños-Vélez², Dorette Freyer¹, Sonja Blumenau¹, Ingo Przesdzing^{1,2},
Rene Bernard^{1,2,3}, Ulrich Dirnagl^{1,2,3,*}

¹ Department of Experimental Neurology, Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany

² QUEST Center for Transforming Biomedical Research, Berlin Institute of Health, Berlin, Germany

³ NeuroCure Cluster of Excellence, Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany

* Corresponding author

E-mail: ulrich.dirnagl@charite.de

orcid.org/0000-0003-0755-6119

Abstract

How much can we rely on whether what was reported in a study was actually done?

Systematic and independent examination of records, documents and processes through audits are a central element of quality management systems. In the context of current concerns about the robustness and reproducibility of experimental biomedical research audits have been suggested as a remedy a number of times. However, audits are resource intense and time consuming, and due to their very nature may be perceived as inquisition. Consequently, there is very little experience or literature on auditing and assessments in the complex preclinical biomedical research environment. To gain some insight into which audit approaches might best suit biomedical research in academia, in this study we have applied a number of them in a typical academic neuroscience environment consisting of twelve research groups with about 100 researchers, students and technicians, utilizing the full gamut of state of the art methodology. Several types of assessments and internal as well as external audits (including the novel format of a peer audit) were systematically explored by a team of quality management specialists. An experimental design template was developed (and is provided here) that takes into account and mitigates difficulties, risks and systematic errors that may occur during the course of a study. All audits were performed according to a pre-defined workflow developed by us. Outcomes were assessed qualitatively. We asked for feedback from participating employees in every final discussion of an audit and documented this in the audit reports. Based on these reports follow-up audits were improved. We conclude that several realistic options for auditing exist which have the potential to improve preclinical biomedical research in academia, and have listed specific recommendations regarding their benefits and provided practical resources for their implementation (e.g. study design and audit templates, audit workflow).

Introduction

Almost a decade ago, several large pharmaceutical companies blew the whistle on something that had worried the industry for some while: An exceedingly high rate of failures when trying to reproduce pivotal results of studies performed in academic laboratories, most of which were published in top tier journals [1] [2]. Since then meta-research has identified substantial deficits in the planning, execution, analysis, and dissemination of results of preclinical biomedical research [3] [4]. It appears that preclinical biomedicine is afflicted by a systemic quality problem [5]. A number of remedies have been suggested, some of which appear to gain traction [6] in increasing transparency and data sharing.

Rooted in the beginnings of modern science as an affair of “gentlemen”[7], today's research enterprise is still based largely on trust among scientists [8]. However, given the hyper-competitiveness of the academic system, how much can we rely on that what was reported was actually done? Or exclude that things were done that were not reported? Any laboratory can claim that processes have been implemented to safeguard research quality, for example methods to minimize bias such as randomization and blinding, or the adherence to Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). However, such claims need to be verifiable to be useful to the community. It needs to be demonstrated that what should be done is being done.

Funders and journals increasingly request compliance with their own [9], [10] or general standards, such as making data publicly available, or complying with reporting guidelines such as ARRIVE [11]. Unfortunately, the available evidence suggests that these measures are of limited success [12], [13] [14] [15]. It appears that self-reporting of adherence to research quality standard often fails to reflect actual improvements in research practice.

Structured quality management systems (QMS) [16] [17], and more relevant to biomedicine, Good Clinical Practice (GCP) methodology [18] require auditing to avoid discrepancies between reporting and what was actually done in a study. Audits of academic non-clinical research have been

suggested a number of times [19] [20] [21]. A recent computer simulation suggests that random auditing of research groups can improve research quality, and is highly cost effective [6]. In addition to safeguarding Good Scientific Practice (GSP), auditing may bring additional benefits such as promoting scientific collaboration, the development of common protocols, or fostering communication, transparency and continuous improvement of the scientific processes.

However, audits are resource intense and time consuming, and due to their very nature may be perceived as inquisition. Besides lack of funding, expertise, and a dearth of suitable systems, the prospect of auditing may be among the chief reasons why academia has so far shunned QM systems altogether. In our own experience with ISO 9001 [16], the audits performed by the certification agency were disappointing: Research specific deficiencies in our quality management remained undetected by the auditors untrained in preclinical research, and targeted advice how to improve research quality was consequently very limited.

The Department of Experimental Neurology with its diverse methodological research structure at one of the largest research hospitals in Europe is in an ideal position to investigate whether the controversial instrument of auditing can be practically and effectively applied to an academic research environment to hold researchers more accountable to quality standard in their daily work. Therefore, we have developed a QM system tailored to research [24], in which different forms of assessments and audits are investigated. Specific criteria were favorable cost-benefit ratio, acceptance by our scientists, but also potential efficiency and applicability for other academic biomedical research institutions.

In the following, we will first review which forms of audits we considered suitable for academic preclinical biomedical research and therefore were tested at our department over a time period of several years. Preliminary results of those tests are then presented, and limitations of our approaches discussed.

Methods

The Department of Experimental Neurology

The research environment of the Department of Experimental Neurology consists of twelve research groups with about 100 researchers, students and technicians. They study fundamental mechanisms of cerebrovascular physiology and pathophysiology using a variety of state-of-the-art technologies and approaches, including molecular biology, cell biology, biochemistry, ultrahigh field magnetic resonance imaging, histology, multi-photon microscopy, in vivo modelling of diseases in rodents, cell cultures and brain organoids, and others.

Types of audits evaluated at the Department of Experimental Neurology

In research, an audit is a systematic and independent examination of records, documents and processes of an organization (e.g. university, department, research group) to ensure compliance to pre-specified requirements or criteria. An assessment is a demonstration that specified requirements relating to a product, process, system, person or body are fulfilled as defined in ISO 17000. A number of different audits and assessment methods with various prerequisites and objectives are in principle relevant at the academic preclinical research setting [17] [22].

Table 1 lists all types of audits and assessments performed at the Department of Experimental Neurology as part of our ISO 9001 certification and later quest to establish a bespoke academic QM system. Self-assessments were carried out in the form of risk and error management, as well as internal audits such as method, data, documentation and process audits. A special form of internal auditing were ring audits of the Charité, which were carried out in preparation for the external audits. External audits according to ISO 9001 were conducted in the form of certification and monitoring audits. As a novel form of external audits, a peer audit was devised and performed by

experts from another scientific research team (German Mouse Clinic, GMC, Munich Germany). Peer audits are more informal, less structured and aim to evaluate the actual rather than the formal performance.

Table 1. Types of audits and assessments performed at the Department of Experimental

Neurology. For a more detailed description of specific assessments and audits, see Table 2.

Assessments / Audits (Aim)		Who	What	How	Update cycle
A S S E S S M E N T S	Risk Assessment, Assessment of Failures and Errors (identification of risks and needs)	QM competent personnel; scientist	- specific aspects of a scientific project or study - key and support process items for which a risk exist - introduction of new standards	<u>Risk Assessment:</u> <i>FMEA*</i> <u>Error Management:</u> <i>LabCIRS*[23]</i> , list of errors	- once a year for pre-identified risks and ad hoc when research environment changes significantly
	Audits of Methods, Data, Documentation, or Processes (identification of processes or areas that need to be improved)	QM competent personnel; trained scientist	- evaluation of usefulness and effectiveness of implemented measures - identification of gaps	- checklists - documents (e.g. SOPs) - study plan / protocol	- once to several times a year
A U D I T S	Internal Ring Audits of the Charité (review of formal requirements)	internal auditor of the Charité	preparation for certification and monitoring audits	- checklists - documents (e.g. SOPs)	- once a year, prior to external audits
E X T E R N A L A U D I T S	Peer Audit (identification of compliance with own requirements)	qualified scientist	- QM system - review of research projects and processes	- questionnaires - checklists - documents (e.g. SOPs) - study plan / protocol	- once during a project
	Certification- and Monitoring Audits (ISO 9001) (identification of compliance with formal requirements of the norm)	external auditor	- validation of QM system - research projects and processes	- checklists - ISO-norm	- once a year in an certification cycle

*FMEA: Failure Mode and Effects Analysis *LabCIRS: Laboratory Critical Incident Reporting System

Table 2 further details the methods used to carry out these audits, the audit objectives, and the frequency and the time point when they were performed.

Table 2. Description of the assessments and audits listed in Table 1

Assessments / Audits		When / How often	Method	Objectives
S E L F A S S E S S M E N T	Risk Assessment	during the ISO-certification, three times (once a year)	FMEA [22]: All identified risks were recorded by criteria such as flawed methods or results during project progress, project delay, error, loss of data records, etc. The risk score was determined by multiplying the influencing variables' "probability of the occurrence of the risk", "significance for practice when the risk occurs" and "probability of the discovery of the risk that occurred". The higher this figure is, the greater the significance of the risk and the earlier measures had to be taken to avoid it.	- evaluation of processes that run the risk of not fulfilling quality, safety or legal requirements
	Assessment of Failures and Errors	ongoing process since six years	- started with a list of errors placed in every laboratory - after two years, implementation of LabCIRS, an anonymous, free, open-source online tool, developed by us for this purpose [23]: Error reports are entered anonymously on a computer. QM competent personnel and researchers regularly analyze all error messages; countermeasures are taken with the aim of avoiding systematic errors in the future. Newly established measures are made known to all in the department.	- identification of errors in the daily work routine
I N T E R N A L A U D I T S	Audits of Methods, Data, Documentation, Processes	once to several times a year: Methods: 5x Data: 1x Documentation: 5x Processes: 2x	- Methods: Core methods (e.g. middle cerebral artery occlusion, preparation of primary cultures of neurons) have been described by scientists through SOPs or working instructions. A member of another working group, but also expert on the described method, examined and questioned the specific implementation, discussed the results and made suggestions for improvement if necessary. In this way, SOPs were checked for deviations or gaps. - Data: The archiving procedures of the primary data, and the adherence and practicability of the related SOP were reviewed. - Documentation: Project managers, scientist and QM personnel checked whether the documentation requirements were being fulfilled. - Processes: A specially developed, detailed experimental/project-planning tool, available as a template in the electronic laboratory notebook, was tested and validated on two projects.	- evaluation of methods, processes and data to be improved - comparison of methods - verification of usefulness and effectiveness of implemented measures - validation of relevant changes to on-going processes or projects - review of compliance with own requirements
	Internal Ring Audits of the Charité	during the ISO-certification, three times (once a year)	These regular onsite visits were carried out in teams of two to prepare for the certification and subsequent monitoring audits. Spot checks were carried out to ensure	- evaluation of compliance with the ISO-norm

		before an external audit	compliance with ISO 9001 and included document management, checklists, forms or the results of key performance indicators.	
E X T E R N A L A U D I T S	Peer Audit	once, in three working groups of the department	In this unidirectional peer audit, two research groups with expertise in the same field exchanged methods and protocols, reviewed the corresponding procedures and evidence of consistency. They compared methodologies, checked for adherence to protocol or published methodology, best practice details, and discussed potential problems. Scientists with and without training in Quality Assurance, but sufficient background in the audited methods checked for compliance with the detailed experimental / project-planning procedures of the audited project, as specified in the electronic laboratory notebook via a template.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - plausibility checks - comparison of methods - scientific exchange - review of projects and processes
	Certification- and Monitoring Audits (ISO 9001)	three times, during the ISO-certification	A certification body verified that our processes, personnel, and management system were compliant with the ISO 9001 requirements of the quality management system (QMS). Following the certification, two monitoring audits were performed, by examining the compliance with requirements of the norm in random checks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - check whether the QMS is up and running as specified - certification

Template for experimental planning of the audited experiment or study

The Department of Experimental Neurology has developed an experimental design template that takes into account and mitigates difficulties, risks and systematic errors that may occur during the course of a study. Specific questions in the template are geared to reduce the risk of bias in the experiments and raise awareness for project-specific quality issues. This template was developed, used and tested during the peer audit (see **Table 2**).

Template Audit Plan

An audit plan must be prepared before each audit. In advance, the subjects to be audited and the corresponding schedule are agreed with all participants (see **S1 Template Audit Plan**). In terms of transparency and reliability, it is important to comply with the audit plan, which is the responsibility of the auditing persons.

Types of audits and assessments, which are not performed at the Department of Experimental Neurology

Quality management systems use several types of audits and assessments, often to maintain certification and accreditation. Each organization defines which types are best suited to its needs and establishes corresponding audit program objectives. Most available systems are set out to optimize products, services, customer- and supplier relationships all of which have limited applicability in the preclinical academic context. Therefore, several types of audits, such as customer or supplier audits, were not feasible in our environment because we work in a non-regulated, academic, pre-clinical context. We focused only on those considered applicable to our environment in order to identify and analyze potential gaps (such as in protocols, in the implementation of methods, in the storage of raw data etc.). Table 3 provides a selection of audit types that might be of interest in biotechnological laboratories for example, but are not useful in the biomedical research we conduct.

Table 3. Examples for types of audits and assessments, which were considered, but not performed at the Department of Experimental Neurology.

Non-Performed Assessments/Audits	not performed because:	Annotations
Self-Assessment with Checklists (Data, Methods, Processes)	-complex of topics too important for self-checks -is carried out in the internal audit by quality personnel or trained scientists	
Internal Audit Supplier-, Performance-, Compliance Audit	-a supplier audit (aiming to check and improve the current quality and delivery processes) is not important for an academic research institution -performance audits (check of an entity's operations to determine if specific programs or functions are working as intended to achieve stated goals) and compliance audits (review of an organization's adherence to regulatory guidelines) were covered by the certification and monitoring audits	important audits for industry
External Audit Accreditation Audit	Department of Experimental Neurology has no accreditation	only service laboratories are accredited

Audit Workflow

All types of audit specified in **Table 2** were performed according to a pre-defined workflow developed by us (see Fig 1). Audits always included four main steps: Preparation, Execution, Evaluation & Reporting and Proof of Effectiveness. This quality assurance workflow allows the close support of a specific project as well as an entire organization, thus making the improvement at different levels in preclinical research possible. It should be noted that the performance of i.e. internal audits or proof of effectiveness is not necessarily required by professional auditors or QM personnel, but can also be carried out by scientists who are familiar with the audit topic.

Fig 1. Audit Workflow

Fig 1 legend: This audit workflow describes the four steps performed during an audit in an academic preclinical research environment, but is universally applicable to all areas in which audits are performed. This audit workflow is a practical example of Deming's PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle, which incorporates the process of continuous improvement.

Results

As integral part of structured quality management in our department, we carried out and evaluated different types of audits and assessments (such as methods-, data-, process- or peer audits) in an environment typical for preclinical academic research (for details see **Table 1 and 2** above).

Audits were considered successful if they were accepted by the employees, conducted in a clear and non-aversive language, and if the scope and objectives of the audit were clearly defined and if the measures resulting from the audits proved to be effective. Acceptance we defined as agreement of the employees with the objective, focus and manner in which the audit was carried out. The audits were not performed in the style of an examination, but presented as an opportunity for improvement and further development of problems and difficult issues.

The acceptance of the audits was assessed qualitatively. We asked for feedback from participating employees in every final discussion of an audit and documented this in the audit reports. Based on these reports we improved the follow-up audits.

Through our practical experience, we are able to make recommendations for types of audits suitable for preclinical research, which are accepted by researchers, technicians and students. Suitability refers to their importance and relevance in the non-regulated research environment, compliance with regulatory requirement, and the generation of robust results. A summary of the advantages and disadvantages of each type of audit can be found in **Table 4**.

Table 4. Results of audits and assessments performed in the Department of Experimental Neurology.

Assessments / Audits		Advantages	Disadvantages
S E L F A S S E S S M E N T	Risk Assessment with FMEA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - establishes risk awareness - existing risks identified and recorded - risks can be avoided or mitigated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - complex and time consuming - risk scores are determined arbitrarily - someone must track the measures to prevent risks
	Assessment of Failures and Errors with LabCIRS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - establishes awareness for error reporting - allows learning from errors - systematic errors can be prevented - creation of a transparent error culture - anonymous online tool accepted by researches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - needs a person responsible for communicating the reported errors and verifying actions taken to prevent recurrence
I N T E R N A L A U D I T S	Audits of Methods, Data, Documentation, Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - can be carried out ad hoc by QM competent personnel or trained scientist when needed - identification of usefulness and effectiveness of implemented measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at least one responsible person within the organization need to have an overview of where and when internal audits are required
	Internal Ring Audits of the institution (Charité)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - prepares for certification and monitoring audits - provides external view - auditors come from the same organization and are familiar with organization-specific processes and institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requires reciprocal audit in another facility of the institution / laboratory - not intended to check in detail any specific procedure - mainly designed for checking the requirements of a certification but not scientific content - needs a person who is trained as an internal auditor
E X T E R N A L A U D I T S	Peer Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - external independent expert view - professional exchange at eye level - fosters scientific collaboration - can positively influence the outcome of a project or process - raises awareness among researchers of specific quality issues - provides evidence on the effectiveness and transparency of the scientific process - accepted by researchers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - time consuming for auditors (who have to attend their own research projects) and auditees - travel expenses if the auditors come from another city - not always easy to find suitable audit partners - requires technological and methodological understanding of the research context from the auditor
	Certification- and Monitoring Audits (ISO 9001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - verifies that all requirements of the norm and legal regulations are fulfilled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the contents of the research processes are only checked to a limited extent - works only as part of a system - high certification costs

Self-assessments

With respect to self-assessment, failure and error management with a structured, anonymous error and critical incidence reporting system (LabCIRS, [23]) was effective in improving research quality. This was reflected in the effectiveness of the measures resulting from the error reports in LabCIRS, the low rate of recurrence of the same error and increased awareness of specific topics. These included, for example, improvements in sample identification, comprehensive documentation of experiments in an electronic laboratory book, and the calibration of pipettes. Within three years, a transparent error culture evolved which was built on the overwhelmingly positive experience and acceptance of discussing errors and their prevention. Interest in our LabCIRS has been growing over time, and meanwhile has not been only adopted by other laboratories but is now centrally offered to anyone in the Charité and MDC ([LabCIRS BIH](#)) research environment.

We found that the various forms of audits differed greatly with respect to requirement of resources, user experience, efficiency, and fitness for purpose. Interestingly, some of the audit types, such as the Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA), despite their popularity in other professions and settings (e.g. in the industry or service sectors), revealed severe drawbacks in an academic research setting. For example, many risks in academic research are connected to limitations in continuity in employment contracts and research funds. Finding solutions to this institutional problem via FMEA is very limited. In our experience, FMEA proved to be time consuming, complex, and unpopular among scientists, as the many diverse discussions in the meetings showed.

Internal Audits

With the help of specific and targeted internal audits, risks, errors and gaps between requirements (own, legal, standard) and actual performance were identified, analyzed, evaluated, corrected, monitored and documented. Internal assessments and audits played a key role in the

implementation of structured quality assurance measures. Due to their systematic approach to specific issues, they proved to be a powerful mechanism for assessing the validity of methods and data and identifying processes and areas for refinement. With their help, it was possible to initiate a process of continuous improvement and to ensure the effectiveness of implemented measures. An example of such a process was an internal audit for the storage of primary data. Here compliance with the valid Standard Operation Procedure (SOP) and Good Scientific Practice (GSP) was checked and measures to improve the process were implemented. The performance of the audit is provided as an example in the audit checklist (see **S2 Checklist Internal and External Audit**). We therefore recommend internal audits as a useful tool for evaluating critical processes and areas in the research environment.

Internal ring audits of the Charité were useful in preparing for the certification according to ISO 9001.

External Audits

Our department underwent external auditing in two different modes, as part of the ISO 9001 certification and as independent project audit performed by an external peer group. The certification audits by an accredited agency did not have the necessary depth to investigate the operational level of our research processes. As a newly certified research unit, the main focus of the audit was on system implementation and compliance with pre-specified standards. In the follow up discussions, the scientific members of our department perceived these audits as not helpful for their research processes.

A peer audit was performed with the help of experts from the German Mouse Clinic (GMC) in Munich, who conducted an audit of a specific project at our department. Primary objective was to obtain proof of concept of the feasibility of this audit format i.e., a project peer review in a research

environment. The audit included external assessment of the project design, plausibility checks, comparison of methods, scientific exchange, and evaluation of the audit format.

Preparing the audit was time-consuming. This format was new for both, the auditors and the audited, and a process had to be developed 'from scratch'. The audit was conducted in a collegial, trusting and open atmosphere. While many audit forms extend their investigations to an entire laboratory or department, peer audits are focused on areas and scientific personnel with direct project involvement.

As opposed to other types of audit during peer audit specifics of the projects were evaluated and discussed in great depth. Using a tailored checklist valuable general and project-specific hints and tips were given. Furthermore, both sides, auditors and participants, exchanged ideas and learned from each other. It must be emphasized, however, that peer audit requires a strong commitment to transparency and academic exchange.

Discussion

Audits are a central element of quality management systems. Due to the fact that structured quality management is almost unknown in academic preclinical research, there is very little experience or literature on auditing and assessments in this complex research environment. Audits can be carried out by a number of different methods, depending on objectives, scope, criteria, duration, available resources, and context. To gain some insight into which audit approaches might best suit biomedical research in academia, we have applied a number of them, and here report our experience.

Our experience in an environment typical of biomedical research, gained in a structured way through the introduction of two different QM systems (ISO 9001, [16] and PREMIER [24]) shows that audits can be very useful in pre-clinical research, especially in the evaluation of data, methods, processes and projects. In addition, we found it advantageous for "like-minded people", i.e.

colleagues or other researchers who can be trusted in terms of expertise and appropriate and reasonable performance, to conduct audits.

Depending on the size of an individual work group, laboratory, or institution, and the type of research, there are various possibilities for self-assessment, risk assessment and internal and external audits in biomedical basic research. In any case, focus and scope of the audit needs to be predefined in a structured process. In our experience, audits were particularly useful in identifying potential errors and critical issues while projects and studies are planned, conducted, and analyzed. This has been demonstrated, for example, by follow-up audits, which examined the effectiveness of the measures introduced in the previous audit. In this way, a process of continuous improvement can be set in motion and quality in preclinical research improved (see Fig 1).

Peer audits as a special case for external audits are aimed at specific research projects, their methods and approaches. Due to their specificity and direct research focus, peer audits have a higher granularity than certification audits, and the findings and recommendations can be applied directly to specific research processes. We have experienced peer auditing as a bi-directional exchange on an equal footing among like-minded researchers, which ensured an open discussion culture and efficient outcome.

Finding suitable peer auditors may be difficult, since it requires expert knowledge in a specific research area or technique, an open attitude towards quality assessment, and a transparent research culture and exchange. One potential caveat concerns competing research interests between peers, as a deep insight into laboratory techniques could potentially reveal details of intellectual property or ideas to a competitor. In addition, the choice of peers may bias the outcome of the audit. Despite these limitations, our department has benefited from the peer audit conducted. We believe that peer audits have great potential as external reviews, as they can have an immediate positive impact on the outcome of a project or process and can build a trusting and lasting relationship between peer auditing groups.

Based on numerous informal discussions with researchers, students and technicians, regular quality meetings, and exchanges with various stakeholders outside our department, we believe that academic researchers accept audits if they are conducted in a clear and non-averse language and if the scope and objectives of the audit are clearly defined.

While our structured approach to audits has been part of our attempts to implement QM in the academic research environment, it is important to note that audits are not dependent on the existence of a QM system. Audits are a general instrument of quality assurance. Robustness and reproducibility of research results can only be achieved if reporting reflects actual practice accurately. In this context, audits are a simple and valid instrument to check the consistency between scientific practice and reporting. Quality assurance in preclinical research is based on measurement and continuous improvement to evaluate the effectiveness of the applied quality measures. To maintain a high level of performance in research work, it is necessary to react to changes in internal and external requirements and to create new solutions. Audits are one possibility to achieve these objectives.

Given the lack of structured QM in pre-clinical research, we suggest that audits should be adapted for use in this area without necessarily relying on an existing QM system. The systematic approach to QM in academic preclinical research that we are currently developing [24] [25] includes an audit module that can be used independently and provides practical advice on how to conduct audits and assessments.

Limitations

Our study has a number of weaknesses and limitations. Although we believe that our research environment is typical for a large fraction of biomedical research laboratories in academia, we can only present anecdotal evidence from one department, one area of research (neuroscience),

and one country (Germany). Our approach was also not preplanned and preregistered, and our outcome assessment is highly subjective. In addition, the number of audits performed was limited. Audits were prepared and conducted by a team of QM professionals in a research environment preconditioned to issues of QM. We nevertheless believe that our experience can be helpful to many stakeholders (researchers, institutions, funders) as to our knowledge it is the first attempt to formally approach this issue. Our results can inform larger and more systematic studies in the future and stimulate discussion.

Conclusions

Despite these limitations, from our hands on experience with various approaches to auditing in preclinical academic research, and the feedback received from multiple stakeholders, we conclude the following:

- Audits, as well as any kind of assessment can only function properly if those audited understand the concept and its merits and participate voluntarily.
- Structured error management with a laboratory critical incidence system [19] is an effective self-assessment activity, which can be implemented relatively easily. Beyond helping in the recurrence of reported errors, it is a powerful tool to introduce a non-punitive error culture.
- Internal process-, document- and data audits are a straightforward approach to identify, analyze, and correct risks, errors and gaps in projects. They safeguard the validity of methods and data and help to identify areas that need improvement. These internal audits foster compliance with the complex legal and regulatory frameworks of biomedical research (animal protection laws, 3R, safety regulations, reporting guidelines like ARRIVE, etc.).
- Depending on the size of the organization, internal audits can be done several times a year and in particular in critical stages of a project. Internal audits are also useful at the organizational level for reviewing quality assurance processes.

- Peer audits are a promising novel tool to solicit external feedback and foster professional exchange of ongoing projects at eye-level. They are very effective in fostering the improvement of methods or processes.
- We recommend conducting at least one peer audit during a project's lifetime, especially if specific methodological challenges need to be solved and an exchange with colleagues is desired.
- Auditing contributes to transparency. In general, and peer audits in particular, auditing might serve as fundamental processes of open and transparent science in the future.
- Careful and collegial communication of expectations and goals is a prerequisite for successful audits.

Audits are an opportunity to safeguard research quality and transparency, not instruments of control. Audits can increase trust between researchers, and between researchers and the public, in particular at times where this trust has eroded. Specific forms of auditing may be selected or further developed to benefit all stakeholders in the system, researchers, institutions, funders, scholarly societies, journals, and the public. We conclude that several realistic options for auditing exist which have the potential to improve research, and have listed specific recommendations regarding their benefits and implementation. Further systematic studies are needed to select and adapt auditing approaches acceptable to and practical for all stakeholders in the academic research enterprise and evaluate how their implementation affects research quality.

Acknowledgements

We thank Valerie Gailus-Durner, Claudia Stöger, Adrian Sanz Moreno, Julia Calzada-Wack (German Mouse Clinic, GMC, Munich, Germany) for performing the peer audit and stimulating discussions.

Nikolas Offenhauser (VIOMEDO, Berlin, Germany) helped us with the ISO certification process.

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Volkswagen Stiftung (Hannover, Germany) for support in developing the PREMIER Quality System.

References

1. Begley CG, Ioannidis JP. Reproducibility in science: improving the standard for basic and preclinical research. *Circ Res*. 2015;116(1):116-26. Epub 2015/01/02. doi: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.114.303819. PubMed PMID: 25552691.
2. Baker M. 1,500 scientists lift the lid on reproducibility. *Nature*. 2016;533(7604):452-4. Epub 2016/05/27. doi: 10.1038/533452a. PubMed PMID: 27225100.
3. Macleod MR, Michie S, Roberts I, Dirnagl U, Chalmers I, Ioannidis JP, et al. Biomedical research: increasing value, reducing waste. *Lancet*. 2014;383(9912):101-4. Epub 2014/01/15. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62329-6. PubMed PMID: 24411643.
4. Begley CG, Buchan AM, Dirnagl U. Robust research: Institutions must do their part for reproducibility. *Nature*. 2015;525(7567):25-7. Epub 2015/09/04. doi: 10.1038/525025a. PubMed PMID: 26333454.
5. Voelkl B, Wurbel H. Reproducibility Crisis: Are We Ignoring Reaction Norms? *Trends Pharmacol Sci*. 2016;37(7):509-10. Epub 2016/05/24. doi: 10.1016/j.tips.2016.05.003. PubMed PMID: 27211784.
6. Barnett AG, Zardo P, Graves N. Randomly auditing research labs could be an affordable way to improve research quality: A simulation study. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(4):e0195613. Epub 2018/04/13. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195613. PubMed PMID: 29649314; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5896971.

7. InstituteofMedicine. Society's Choices: Social and Ethical Decision Making in Biomedicine. Bulger RE, Bobby EM, Fineberg HV, editors. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 1995. 560 p.
8. Yarborough M. Openness in science is key to keeping public trust. *Nature*. 2014;515(7527):313. Epub 2014/11/21. doi: 10.1038/515313a. PubMed PMID: 25409791.
9. Marcus E, whole Cell t. A STAR Is Born. *Cell*. 2016;166(5):1059-60. Epub 2016/08/28. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2016.08.021. PubMed PMID: 27565332.
10. Bishop D. Rein in the four horsemen of irreproducibility. *Nature*. 2019;568(7753):435. Epub 2019/04/26. doi: 10.1038/d41586-019-01307-2. PubMed PMID: 31019328.
11. Kilkenny C, Browne WJ, Cuthill IC, Emerson M, Altman DG. Improving bioscience research reporting: the ARRIVE guidelines for reporting animal research. *PLoS Biol*. 2010;8(6):e1000412. Epub 2010/07/09. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1000412. PubMed PMID: 20613859; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2893951.
12. Leung V, Rousseau-Blass F, Beauchamp G, Pang DSJ. ARRIVE has not ARRIVED: Support for the ARRIVE (Animal Research: Reporting of in vivo Experiments) guidelines does not improve the reporting quality of papers in animal welfare, analgesia or anesthesia. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(5):e0197882. Epub 2018/05/26. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0197882. PubMed PMID: 29795636; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5967836.
13. Federer LM, Belter CW, Joubert DJ, Livinski A, Lu YL, Snyders LN, et al. Data sharing in PLOS ONE: An analysis of Data Availability Statements. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(5):e0194768. Epub 2018/05/03. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0194768. PubMed PMID: 29719004; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5931451.
14. Hair K, Macleod MR, Sena ES, Collaboration II. A randomised controlled trial of an Intervention to Improve Compliance with the ARRIVE guidelines (IICARus). *Res Integr Peer Rev*. 2019;4:12. Epub 2019/06/18. doi: 10.1186/s41073-019-0069-3. PubMed PMID: 31205756; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6560728.

15. NPQIP. Did a change in Nature journals' editorial policy for life sciences research improve reporting? *BMJ Open Science*. 2019;3. doi: 10.1136/bmjos-2017-000035.
16. ISO 9001:2008 Quality management systems — Requirements. 2011 ed. ISO, editor2011.
17. ICH Harmonised Tripartite Guideline Good Manufacturing Practice Guide For Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients Q7 2000.
18. Winchell T. The clinical investigator site audit – process-driven good clinical practice. *Qual Assur J*. 2007;11:138-42.
19. Begley CG, Ellis LM. Drug development: Raise standards for preclinical cancer research. *Nature*. 2012;483(7391):531-3. Epub 2012/03/31. doi: 10.1038/483531a. PubMed PMID: 22460880.
20. Yarborough M, Nadon R, Karlin DG. Four erroneous beliefs thwarting more trustworthy research. *Elife*. 2019;8. Epub 2019/07/30. doi: 10.7554/eLife.45261. PubMed PMID: 31355746; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6688856.
21. Lefevre IA, Balice-Gordon RJ. Learning from Principles of Evidence-Based Medicine to Optimize Nonclinical Research Practices. *Handb Exp Pharmacol*. 2019. Epub 2019/09/19. doi: 10.1007/164_2019_276. PubMed PMID: 31529201.
22. ICH guideline Q9 on quality risk management (2006).
23. Dirnagl U, Przesdzing I, Kurreck C, Major S. A Laboratory Critical Incident and Error Reporting System for Experimental Biomedicine. *PLoS Biol*. 2016;14(12):e2000705. Epub 2016/12/03. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.2000705. PubMed PMID: 27906976; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC65131907.
24. Kurreck C, Castaños-Vélez E, Bernard R, Dirnagl U. PREMIER: Structured quality assurance from and for academic preclinical biomedicine. 2018 *OSF* <https://osf.io/xw75z> .
25. Dirnagl U, Kurreck C, Castanos-Velez E, Bernard R. Quality management for academic laboratories: burden or boon? Professional quality management could be very beneficial for academic research but needs to overcome specific caveats. *EMBO Rep*. 2018;19(11). Epub

2018/10/21. doi: 10.15252/embr.201847143. PubMed PMID: 30341068; PubMed Central

PMCID: PMC6216282.

Supporting information

S1 File. Template Audit Plan

S2 File. Checklist Internal and External Audit

Audit Plan – Internal / External Audit

Type of Audit	
Organization	
Site to be audited	
Scope	
Date	
Contact Person	
Auditors	

Time Schedule	Content	Auditors / Participants
From: To:	Welcome and Opening Dialog Define Procedure of the Audit	
From: To:	Content of the Audit Objectives: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ Subjects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ Procedures (SOPs / Hands-on): Which ones? ☐ Resources, roles & responsibilities ☐ Primary data management ☐ Projects (Which one) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ Experimental plan ☐ Analysis plan & results ☐ Programs (Documentation) 	
From: To:	Auditor(s) evaluation of the results (Meeting Auditors) for preliminary communication to the audited site.	
From: To:	Final post-audit discussion of the results with the audited site.	
Not later than one week after the audit	Draft of the audit results sent to the audited site for review	
Not later than one week after sending the draft	Final report agreed and available to all parties	

Sample Template

Checklist Internal and External Audit

This checklist is an example of a possible implementation of internal and external audits in the field of basic biomedical research in experimental neurology. It has been designed as a practical tool for conducting different types of audits, but it must be adapted to the context of the audited organization. The checklist makes no claim to be complete.

Organization:

Date:

Participants in the Audit:

Auditor(s):

Table A: Internal Audits

Method Audit	Questions
Aim of the Audit	What is expected to be achieved?
Method	Which is the experimental method to be audited? What is the objective or read out of the method?
Application	Who applies the method? Are the people applying the method appropriately trained?
Infrastructure / Resources	Is the working environment suitable for the method to be applied? Are all necessary working materials and reagents available? Are the instruments and measuring equipment calibrated and maintained? Are the chemicals and other consumables used within their shelf life?
Risk	Are there any risks in the implementation of the method? Are strategies in place to mitigate them?
Method Comparison	Ask several people performing the method to describe the steps of the method. Is a protocol available? If so, how did it come about? At what point are differences noticeable between operators?
Documentation	How and where are the data and results documented and analyzed? Is the documentation traceable?
Changes	Does the SOP (protocol) have to be changed? If so, at what points and why?
Improvement	How could the method be improved?
Corrective Activities	Are the corrective actions taken for the method verified for their effectiveness?
Key Performance Indicators KPI	Is there a performance indicator for the method? If so, what is the benefit of the key figure? Can a statement be made with the KPI?
Knowledge Sharing	How is the method passed on and further developed?
Trainings	Is the implementation of the method trained? Who is responsible? In which periods do trainings take place?
Data Audit	Questions
Aim of the Audit	What is expected to be achieved?
Data	What data will be audited? Are the data primary or secondary data?
Generation	How was the data collected? Is there a protocol or standards operating procedure (SOP) for this?
Infrastructure / Resources	Is the working environment in which the data was generated appropriate? Are all necessary working tools and software available? Is the software validated? Are the licenses currently valid?
Risk	Are there any risks in the generation of the data? Are strategies in place to mitigate them?
Storage	How and where is the data stored? Is the storage path within the working group consistent and known to everyone? Do all employees adhere to the specifications?

Sample Template		Checklist Internal and External Audit	
Documentation		How and where is the data documented, analyzed and evaluated? What methods are used?	
Changes		Did the storage of the data have to be changed? If so, for what reason? Where is it stored now?	
Improvements		How could an improvement in data collection and/or storage look like?	
Key Performance Indicators KPI		Is there a performance indicator for data collection? If so, what is the benefit of the key figure? Can a statement be made with the KPI?	
Open Data / Open Access		Will the data be published as open data and open access? If not, why not? Is the implementation known to all parties involved?	
Document Audit		Questions	
Aim of the Audit		What is expected to be achieved?	
Documents		What documents are generated in the area? What are the requirements? Is a Good Documentation Practice available? Are its requirements fulfilled? How does the change process for the documents look like?	
Trainings		Are the staff trained in Good Documentation Practice?	
Archiving		What documents are archived? Where and how long? Are there any legal requirements for this?	
Uses		Who are the users of the documents? Is the usage known to everyone?	
Infrastructure / Resources		Who has "read" and "write" access? How are the documents marked, versioned and updated? Is there a document control system available? Which one?	
Risk		Are there risks in document control? Are they avoided?	
Changes		Has the documentation practice or the document control been changed? If so, at which points and why?	
Improvements		How could the documentation be improved?	
Key Performance Indicators KPI		Is there a performance indicator for documentation? If so, what is the benefit of the key figure? Can a statement be made with the KPI?	
Knowledge Sharing		How is the documentation passed on?	
Process Audit		Questions	
Aim of the Audit		What is expected to be achieved?	
Process		Which is the process is to be audited? What is the goal of the process? What are the requirements for the process?	
Users		Who are the users of the process? Is its application known to everyone involved?	
Responsibilities		How are the responsibilities within the process defined? Are they followed? Are there gaps? If so, why?	
Infrastructure / Resources		Is the working environment in which the process is to be performed appropriate? Are all necessary working materials available? Are the devices and measuring equipment calibrated and maintained?	
Risk		Are there any risks in the process? Are strategies in place to mitigate them?	
Description		Is a suitable description for the process? If not, why not? If so, what is the situation? Have plausibility checks been carried out?	
Documentation		How and where is the process documented? Is it traceable? Is there a protocol for the process? Is it standardized?	
Requirements		Are the requirements placed on the process fulfilled? If not, why not?	
Changes		Does the process need to be changed? If so, at what points and why?	
Improvements		How could the process be improved?	
Key Performance Indicators KPI		Is there a performance indicator for the process? If so, what is the benefit of the key figure? Can a statement be made with the the KPI?	
Knowledge sharing		How is the knowledge about the implementation of processes / passed on and further developed?	

Sample Template	Checklist Internal and External Audit
-----------------	---------------------------------------

Table B: External Audit

Peer Audit	Questions
Aim of the Audit	What is expected to be achieved?
People involved	Who are the persons / groups involved in the Peer Audit?
Review of Projects and Processes	Which project or process is being reviewed? Are methods be compared? If so, which ones?
Uses	Who is involved in the audited processes or projects? Is their participation known to the project responsible?
Responsibilities	How are the responsibilities within the project/process defined? Are they observed? Are there gaps? If so, why?
Infrastructure / Resources	Is the working environment in which the process take place appropriate? Are all necessary working materials available? Are the relevant devices and measuring equipment calibrated and maintained?
Risks	Are risks known which have influenced the project/process and which could have been avoided in advance?
Project (Study) Planning	Was a complete project planning carried out before starting the experiments? Is a suitable study design available for the project/process? If not, why not? If so, what is the situation? Has a suitable hypothesis / counter-hypothesis been formulated? Has a plausibility check been carried out? Is the entire project planning traceable and documented?
Pre-registration	Is the project pre-registered? If not, why not?
Documentation	How is the project documented? Is the documentation comprehensible? Do SOPs or protocols exist for the implementation of the project?
Publication	Has the project already been published? Are the results reproducible? Are the evaluations and analyses comprehensible?
Changes	Should any changes in project planning, implementation, evaluation or reporting be done? If so, why?
Improvements	How could an improvement of the project look like?
Scientific Exchange	Experiences of the auditors on methods, implementation, evaluations etc. Were there any unusual features in the project? Discussion on plausibility and open questions that arose during the audit.
View from the Outside	Summary of the audit: what was positive, what should be improved? Hints and tips from the external colleagues. Possible emerging cooperation between auditors and audited.