The protocol of a clinical trial serves as the foundation for study planning, conduct, reporting, and appraisal. However, trial protocols and existing protocol guidelines vary greatly in content and quality. This article describes the systematic development and scope of SPIRIT (Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials) 2013, a guideline for the minimum content of a clinical trial protocol.

The 33-item SPIRIT checklist applies to protocols for all clinical trials and focuses on content rather than format. The checklist recommends a full description of what is planned; it does not prescribe how to design or conduct a trial. By providing guidance for key content, the SPIRIT recommendations aim to facilitate the drafting of high-quality protocols. Adherence to SPIRIT would also enhance the transparency and completeness of trial protocols for the benefit of investigators, trial participants, patients, sponsors, funders, research ethics committees or institutional review boards, peer reviewers, journals, trial registries, policymakers, regulators, and other key stakeholders.

Development of the SPIRIT 2013 Statement

The SPIRIT 2013 Statement was developed in broad consultation with 115 key stakeholders, including trial investigators (n = 30); health care professionals (n = 31); methodologists (n = 34); statisticians (n = 16); trial coordinators (n = 14); journal editors (n = 15); and representatives from the research ethics community (n = 17), industry and nonindustry funders (n = 7), and regulatory agencies (n = 3), whose roles are not mutually exclusive. As detailed later, the SPIRIT guideline was developed through 2 systematic reviews, a formal Delphi consensus process, 2 face-to-face consensus meetings, and piloting (32).

The SPIRIT checklist evolved through several iterations. The process began with a preliminary checklist of 59 items derived from a systematic review of existing protocol guidelines (17). In 2007, 96 expert panelists from 17 low- (n = 1), middle- (n = 6), and high-income (n = 10) countries refined this initial checklist over 3 iterative Delphi consensus survey rounds by e-mail (33). Panelists rated each item on a scale of 1 (not important) to 10 (very important), suggested new items, and provided comments that were circulated in subsequent rounds. Items with a median score of 8 or higher in the final round were included, whereas those rated 5 or lower were excluded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Item</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial registration</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set <em>(Appendix Table, available at <a href="http://www.annals.org">www.annals.org</a>)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol version</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Date and version identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>5a-5d</td>
<td>Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors, writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background and rationale</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Specific objectives or hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial design</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Description of trial design, including type of trial (e.g., parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (e.g., superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants, interventions, and outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study setting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Description of study settings (e.g., community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility criteria</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centers and individuals who will perform the interventions (e.g., surgeons, psychotherapists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11b</td>
<td>Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (e.g., drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11c</td>
<td>Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (e.g., drug tablet return, laboratory tests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11d</td>
<td>Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (e.g., systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (e.g., change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (e.g., median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant timeline</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Time schedule of enrollment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended <em>(Figure)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrollment to reach target sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Sequence generation</td>
<td>16a</td>
<td>Method of generating the allocation sequence (e.g., computer-generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (e.g., blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enroll participants or assign interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment mechanism Implementation</td>
<td>16b</td>
<td>Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (e.g., central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding (masking)</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (e.g., trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant’s allocated intervention during the trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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checklist. This review also provided the evidence base of studies cited in the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation and Elaboration paper (31). Some items had little or no identified empirical evidence (for example, the title) and are included in the checklist on the basis of a strong pragmatic or ethical rationale.

Finally, we pilot-tested the draft checklist in 2010 and 2011 with University of Toronto graduate students who used the document to develop trial protocols as part of a master’s-level course on clinical trial methods. Their feedback on the content, format, and usefulness of the checklist was obtained through an anonymous survey and incorporated into the final SPIRIT checklist.

**Definition of a Clinical Trial Protocol**

Although every study requires a protocol, the precise definition of a protocol varies among individual investigators, sponsors, and other stakeholders. For the SPIRIT initiative, the protocol is defined as a document that provides sufficient detail to enable understanding of the background, rationale, objectives, study population, interventions, methods, statistical analyses, ethical considerations, dissemination plans, and administration of the trial; replication of key aspects of trial methods and conduct; and appraisal of the trial’s scientific and ethical rigor from ethics approval to dissemination of results.

The protocol is more than a list of items. It should be a cohesive document that provides appropriate context and narrative to fully understand the elements of the trial. For example, the description of a complex intervention may need to include training materials and figures to enable replication by persons with appropriate expertise.

The full protocol must be submitted for approval by an institutional review board (IRB) or research ethics committee (34). It is recommended that trial investigators or sponsors address the SPIRIT checklist items in the protocol before submission. If the details for certain items have not yet been finalized, then this should be stated in the protocol and the items updated as they evolve.

The protocol is a “living” document that is often modified during the trial. A transparent audit trail with dates of important changes in trial design and conduct is an essential part of the scientific record. Trial investigators and sponsors are expected to adhere to the protocol as approved by the IRB and to document amendments made in the most recent protocol version. Important protocol amendments should be reported to IRBs and trial registries as they occur and subsequently be described in trial reports.

**Scope of the SPIRIT 2013 Statement**

The SPIRIT 2013 Statement applies to the content of a clinical trial protocol, including its appendices. A clinical trial is a prospective study in which 1 or more interventions are assigned to human participants to assess the effects on health-related outcomes. The primary scope of SPIRIT 2013 relates to randomized trials, but the same considerations substantially apply to all types of clinical trials, regardless of study design, intervention, or topic.

The SPIRIT 2013 Statement provides guidance for minimum protocol content. Certain circumstances may warrant additional protocol items. For example, a factorial study design may require specific justification; crossover trials have unique statistical considerations, such as carryover effects; and industry-sponsored trials may have additional regulatory requirements.
The protocol and its appendices are often the sole repository of detailed information relevant to every SPIRIT checklist item. Using existing trial protocols, we have been able to identify model examples of every item (31), which illustrates the feasibility of addressing all checklist items in a single protocol document. For some trials, relevant details may appear in related documents, such as statistical analysis plans, case record forms, operations manuals, or investigator contracts (35, 36). In these instances, the protocol should outline the key principles and refer to the separate documents so that their existence is known.

The SPIRIT 2013 Statement primarily relates to the content of the protocol rather than its format, which is often subject to local regulations, traditions, or standard operating procedures. Nevertheless, adherence to certain formatting conventions, such as a table of contents; section headings; glossary; list of abbreviations; list of references; and a schematic schedule of enrollment, interventions, and assessments, will facilitate protocol review (Figure).

Finally, the intent of SPIRIT 2013 is to promote transparency and a full description of what is planned—not to prescribe how a trial should be designed or conducted. The checklist should not be used to judge trial quality, because the protocol of a poorly designed trial may address all checklist items by fully describing its inadequate design features. Nevertheless, the use of SPIRIT 2013 may improve the validity and success of trials by reminding investigators about important issues to consider during the planning stages.

**Relation to Existing Clinical Trial Guidance**

With its systematic development process, consultation with international stakeholders, and explanatory paper citing relevant empirical evidence (31), SPIRIT 2013 builds on other international guidance applicable to clinical trial protocols. It adheres to the ethical principles mandated by the 2008 Declaration of Helsinki, particularly the requirement that the protocol address specific ethical considerations, such as competing interests (34).

In addition, SPIRIT 2013 encompasses the protocol items recommended by the International Conference on Harmonisation Good Clinical Practice E6 guidance, written in 1996 for clinical trials whose data are intended for submission to regulatory authorities (37). The SPIRIT Statement builds on the Good Clinical Practice guidance by providing additional recommendations on specific key protocol items (for example, allocation concealment, trial registration, and consent processes). In contrast to SPIRIT, the Good Clinical Practice guidance used informal consensus methods, has unclear contributorship, and lacks citation of supporting empirical evidence (38).

The SPIRIT 2013 Statement also supports trial registration requirements from the World Health Organization (39), the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (40), legislation pertaining to ClinicalTrials.gov (41), the European Commission (42), and others. For example, item 2b of the SPIRIT checklist recommends that the protocol list the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set (Appendix Table, available at www.annals.org), which is the minimum amount of information that the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors mandates for trial registries. Having this data set in its own protocol section is intended not only to serve as a form of trial summary but also to help improve the quality of information in registry entries. Registration-specific data could be easily identified in the protocol section and copied into the registry fields. In addition, protocol amendments applicable to this section could prompt investigators to update their registry data.

The SPIRIT 2013 Statement mirrors applicable items from CONSORT 2010 (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials) (43). Consistent wording and structure used for items common to both checklists will facilitate the transition from a SPIRIT-based protocol to a final report based on CONSORT. The SPIRIT Group has also engaged leaders of other initiatives relevant to protocol standards, such as trial registries, the Clinical Data Interchange Standards Consortium Protocol Representation Group, and Pragmatic Randomized Controlled Trials in Health Care, to align international efforts in promoting transparency and high-quality protocol content.

**Potential Effect**

An extensive range of stakeholders could benefit from widespread use of the SPIRIT 2013 Statement and its explanatory paper (Table 2). Pilot-testing and informal feedback have shown that it is particularly valuable for trial investigators when they draft their protocols. It can also serve as an informational resource for new investigators, peer reviewers, and IRB members.

There is also potential benefit for trial implementation. The excessive delay from the time of protocol development to ethics approval and the start of participant recruitment remains a major concern for clinical trials (44). Improved completeness of protocols could help increase the efficiency of protocol review by reducing avoidable queries to investigators about incomplete or unclear information. With full documentation of key information and increased awareness of important considerations before the trial begins, the use of SPIRIT may also help to reduce the number and burden of subsequent protocol amendments—many of which can be avoided with careful protocol drafting and development (15). Widespread adoption of SPIRIT 2013 as a single standard by IRBs, funding agencies, regulatory agencies, and journals could simplify the work of trial investigators and sponsors, who could fulfill the common application requirements of multiple stakeholders with a single SPIRIT-based protocol. Better protocols would also help trial personnel to implement the study as the protocol authors intended.
Furthermore, adherence to SPIRIT 2013 could help ensure that protocols contain the requisite information for critical appraisal and trial interpretation. High-quality protocols can provide important information about trial methods and conduct that is not available from journals or trial registries (45–47). As a transparent record of the researchers’ original intent, comparisons of protocols with final trial reports can help to identify selective reporting of results and undisclosed amendments (48), such as changes to primary outcomes (19, 49). However, clinical trial protocols are not generally accessible to the public (45). The SPIRIT 2013 Statement will have a greater effect when protocols are publicly available to facilitate full evaluation of trial validity and applicability (11, 12, 14, 50).

The SPIRIT 2013 guideline needs the support of key stakeholders to achieve its greatest impact (Table 2), as seen with widely adopted reporting guidelines, such as CONSORT (51). We will post the names of organizations that have endorsed SPIRIT 2013 on the SPIRIT Web site (www.spirit-statement.org) and provide resources to facilitate implementation. Widespread adoption of the SPIRIT recommendations can help improve protocol drafting, content, and implementation; facilitate registration, efficiency, and appraisal of trials; and ultimately enhance transparency for the benefit of patient care.


**Table 2. Potential Benefits and Proposed Stakeholder Actions for Supporting Adherence to SPIRIT 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
<th>Potential Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical trial groups, investigators, sponsors</strong></td>
<td>Adopt SPIRIT as standard guidance for writing protocols</td>
<td>Improved quality, completeness, and consistency of protocol content; Enhanced understanding of rationale and issues to consider for key protocol items; Increased efficiency of protocol review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research ethics committees/institutional review boards, funding agencies, regulatory agencies</strong></td>
<td>Mandate or encourage adherence to SPIRIT for submitted protocols Use as training tool</td>
<td>Improved quality, completeness, and consistency of protocol submissions; Increased efficiency of review and reduction in queries about protocol requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educators</strong></td>
<td>Use SPIRIT checklist and explanatory paper as a training tool</td>
<td>Enhanced understanding of the rationale and issues to consider for key protocol items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patients, trial participants, policymakers</strong></td>
<td>Advocate use of SPIRIT by trial investigators and sponsors</td>
<td>Improved protocol content relevant to transparency, accountability, critical appraisal, and oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trial registries</strong></td>
<td>Encourage SPIRIT-based protocols; Register full protocols to accompany results disclosure</td>
<td>Improved quality of registry records; Prompt for trialists to update registry record when SPIRIT checklist item 2b (Registration Data Set) is updated; Improved quality, completeness, and consistency of protocol content for registries that house full protocols and results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal editors and publishers</strong></td>
<td>Endorse SPIRIT as standard guidance for published and unpublished protocols; Include reference to SPIRIT in instructions for authors; Ask that protocols be submitted with manuscripts, circulate them to peer reviewers, and encourage authors to make them available as Web appendices</td>
<td>Improved quality, completeness, and consistency of protocol content; Enhanced peer review of trial manuscripts through improved protocol content, which can be used to assess protocol adherence and selective reporting; Improved transparency and interpretation of trials by readers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Appendix Table. World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Primary registry and trial-identifying number</td>
<td>Name of primary registry and the unique identifier assigned by the primary registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Date of registration in primary registry</td>
<td>Date when the trial was officially registered in the primary registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Secondary identifying numbers</td>
<td>Other identifiers, if any: Universal Trial Number, Identifiers assigned by the sponsor, Other trial registration numbers issued by other registries, Identifiers issued by funding bodies, collaborative research groups, regulatory authorities, ethics committees/institutional review boards, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sources of monetary or material support</td>
<td>Major sources of monetary or material support for the trial (e.g., funding agency, foundation, company, institution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Primary sponsor</td>
<td>Person, organization, group, or other legal entity that takes responsibility for initiating and managing a study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Secondary sponsor(s)</td>
<td>Additional persons, organizations, or other legal persons, if any, who have agreed with the primary sponsor to take on responsibilities of sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Contact for public queries</td>
<td>E-mail address, telephone number, and postal address of the contact who will respond to general queries, including information about current recruitment status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Contact for scientific queries</td>
<td>Name and title, e-mail address, telephone number, postal address, and affiliation of the principal investigator and e-mail address, telephone number, postal address, and affiliation of the contact for scientific queries about the trial (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public title</td>
<td>Title intended for the lay public in easily understood language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Scientific title</td>
<td>Scientific title of the study as it appears in the protocol submitted for funding and ethical review; include trial acronym, if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Countries of recruitment</td>
<td>Countries from which participants will be recruited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied</td>
<td>Primary health condition(s) or problem(s) studied (e.g., depression, breast cancer, medication error)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intervention(s)</td>
<td>For each group of the trial, record a brief intervention name plus an intervention description: Intervention name: For drugs, use the generic name; for other types of interventions, provide a brief descriptive name. Intervention description: Must be sufficiently detailed for it to be possible to distinguish between the groups of a study; for example, interventions involving drugs may include dosage form, dosage, frequency, and duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Key inclusion and exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participant selection, including age and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Study type</td>
<td>Method of allocation (randomized/nonrandomized), Blinding/masking (identify who is blinded), Assignment (e.g., single group, parallel, crossover, factorial), Purpose, Phase (if applicable). For randomized trials: Method of sequence generation and allocation concealment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Date of first enrollment</td>
<td>Anticipated or actual date of enrollment of the first participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Target sample size</td>
<td>Total number of participants to enroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Recruitment status</td>
<td>Pending: Participants are not yet being recruited or enrolled at any site, Recruiting, Suspended: Temporary halt in recruitment and enrollment, Complete: Participants are no longer being recruited or enrolled, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Primary outcome(s)</td>
<td>The primary outcome should be the outcome used in sample size calculations or the main outcome used to determine the effects of the intervention, For each primary outcome provide: Name of the outcome (do not use abbreviations), Metric or method of measurement used (be as specific as possible), Time point of primary interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Key secondary outcome(s)</td>
<td>As for primary outcomes, for each secondary outcome provide: Name of the outcome (do not use abbreviations), Metric or method of measurement used (be as specific as possible), Time point of interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>