WHITE PAPER | JULY 2024

The Evolving CRO-Sponsor Partnership Model

Strategic Value Beyond Outsourcing

Kush Dhody, M.D., M.S.

President, Amarex Clinical Research, LLC (An NSF Company)

Physician-Scientist | Clinical Development Executive | Regulatory Strategy Advisor

The CRO industry stands at an inflection point.
The organizations that will lead are not those that execute tasks,
but those that think like development partners.

This paper examines the structural evolution of the CRO-sponsor relationship from transactional outsourcing to integrated strategic partnership. As the global CRO market approaches $80 billion and emerging biotech companies increasingly drive pipeline innovation, the traditional vendor model is no longer sufficient. Drawing on more than two decades of clinical development leadership across oncology, rare diseases, wound care, and infectious diseases, this paper argues that full-service, mid-size CROs are uniquely positioned to deliver the scientific depth, operational agility, and regulatory expertise that emerging sponsors require. It presents a framework for building strategic development partnerships grounded in operational transparency, shared accountability, and end-to-end program ownership.

Executive Summary

The global contract research organization market has entered a period of structural transformation. Valued at approximately $80 billion in 2024 and projected to exceed $125 billion[1] by the end of the decade, the industry is growing at a compound annual rate approaching 10%. Yet beneath this growth lies a fundamental tension: the traditional outsourcing model, built on transactional fee-for-service relationships, is increasingly misaligned with the needs of the sponsors who drive the majority of pipeline innovation.

Emerging biotech and medtech companies, defined broadly as organizations with R&D expenditure of $300 million or less, now account for a disproportionate share of clinical-stage development programs. These sponsors do not need vendors. They need development partners: organizations that can think like drug developers, provide strategic guidance from IND through submission, and share accountability for program outcomes.

Simultaneously, the CRO landscape has been reshaped by an unprecedented wave of consolidation. In 2021 alone, a record 50 CRO mergers and acquisitions closed, nearly double the prior year's total.[2] Mega-deals involving IQVIA, Thermo Fisher, ICON, and LabCorp have created a small number of dominant platforms with enormous scale. Yet surveys consistently show that nearly half of sponsor decision-makers express concern that large-scale CRO consolidation destabilizes project teams, erodes therapeutic expertise, and compromises the personalized service that complex programs require.[3]

Across more than two decades leading global clinical development programs and CRO operations, I have observed this tension firsthand. The organizations that consistently deliver for their sponsors are not necessarily the largest. They are the ones that operate as strategic extensions of the sponsor's team, scientifically engaged, operationally transparent, and accountable for outcomes rather than activities. This paper examines how the CRO-sponsor relationship is evolving, why the mid-size full-service model offers distinct advantages in complex therapeutic areas, and what both sponsors and CROs must do to build partnerships that are worthy of the science they serve.

The Outsourcing Imperative: Why the Traditional Model Is Failing

Clinical trial outsourcing is no longer optional. It is the dominant operating model for drug development. Nearly three out of every four clinical trials are now conducted by CROs, and outsourcing penetration continues to increase as trial complexity escalates.[4] The clinical trials outsourcing market alone was valued at $46.15 billion in 2023, with projections to reach $70 billion by 2029.[5]

The Scale of Outsourcing Dependence

The drivers of this shift are well understood. Rising trial complexity, global regulatory requirements, the proliferation of specialty indications, and persistent pressure on development timelines have made it impractical for most sponsors to maintain the internal infrastructure required for global trial execution. For emerging biotech companies, which typically operate with lean teams of 20 to 50 people and finite capital, outsourcing is not a strategic choice; it is a structural necessity.

Table 1. CRO Market Landscape (Multiple Sources)

Metric	Data
Global CRO market size (2024 est.)	$80 billion (projected; multiple sources)
Projected market size (2029)	$125+ billion (CAGR ~9%)
Clinical trials outsourcing market (2023)	$46.15 billion
Outsourcing penetration rate	Approximately 75% of all clinical trials
CRO M&A deals in 2021	50 completed transactions (record high)
Oncology share of outsourced trials	Approximately 30–31% (largest therapeutic segment)

Where the Transactional Model Breaks Down

The challenge is not the decision to outsource. It is the model through which outsourcing is executed. The traditional CRO engagement model was designed for large pharmaceutical companies that maintained substantial internal clinical development capabilities. In that context, the CRO served as a capacity extension, executing monitoring visits, managing data, and performing defined tasks under close sponsor oversight. The relationship was transactional by design, with detailed scopes of work, unit-based pricing, and limited CRO involvement in strategic decisions.

This model fails emerging sponsors in predictable ways. A biotech company with a single asset and a 30-person team cannot provide the level of oversight that the transactional model assumes. When the CRO operates as a vendor awaiting instructions rather than a partner contributing strategic judgment, gaps emerge in regulatory strategy, protocol design, operational planning, and risk management. These gaps do not manifest as discrete errors. They manifest as delays, cost overruns, and avoidable regulatory setbacks that can be existential for a company with limited capital.

From Vendor to Strategic Partner: A Structural Transformation

> The distinction between a CRO vendor and a CRO partner is not semantic. It is structural. A vendor executes tasks. A partner owns outcomes.

The evolution from service vendor to strategic development partner represents a fundamental reorientation of how CROs create value. It requires changes in organizational design, talent models, governance structures, and, most importantly, in how the CRO conceptualizes its role in the sponsor's program.

Defining the Strategic Partnership Model

A strategic CRO partnership is characterized by several distinguishing features that separate it from the traditional outsourcing engagement:

- Early engagement in program strategy. The CRO is involved before the protocol is finalized, contributing to IND strategy, regulatory pathway design, and clinical development planning. This is not an upsell; it is a recognition that operational execution is inseparable from strategic design.
- Therapeutic depth over geographic breadth. The CRO brings scientific understanding of the indication, the competitive landscape, and the regulatory expectations specific to the therapeutic area. In rare diseases, oncology, and wound care, this expertise directly affects protocol feasibility, endpoint selection, and enrollment strategy.
- Integrated cross-functional teams. Rather than siloed functional deliverables, the CRO provides an integrated team that spans clinical operations, regulatory affairs, data management, biostatistics, medical monitoring, and pharmacovigilance. The team operates as an extension of the sponsor, not as a separate entity delivering fragmented outputs.
- Shared accountability for outcomes. The partnership is governed by program-level objectives, not task-level metrics. Both parties are aligned around milestones that matter: IND acceptance, successful enrollment, data lock, regulatory submission.
- Transparent governance and communication. Structured oversight mechanisms, including joint steering committees, real-time dashboards, and proactive risk escalation, replace the periodic status reports that characterize transactional relationships.

Table 2. Transactional Outsourcing vs. Strategic Partnership Model

Dimension	Transactional Outsourcing	Strategic Partnership
CRO role	Task execution per scope of work	Program co-ownership with shared accountability
Engagement timing	Post-protocol finalization	Pre-IND or early development planning
Pricing model	Unit-based, fee-for-service	Milestone-based, risk-sharing, or hybrid
Team structure	Functional silos with separate reporting	Integrated cross-functional team
Communication	Periodic status reports	Real-time dashboards, joint governance
Regulatory input	Limited to submission logistics	Strategic regulatory pathway design
Therapeutic expertise	Generalist execution capability	Indication-specific scientific depth
Sponsor oversight required	High (sponsor directs all decisions)	Moderate (CRO contributes strategic judgment)

The Industry Shift Is Already Underway

This transformation is not theoretical. Across the industry, sponsors are increasingly seeking partners who can deliver fully integrated, end-to-end solutions, particularly in the development of advanced therapies that require customized support from early-phase research through market readiness.[6] Sponsors are involving CROs earlier in the drug development lifecycle, sometimes as early as the discovery phase, reflecting a recognition that operational efficiency and strategic design are interdependent.

The financial rationale is compelling. Poor CRO selection can result in delays costing more than $500,000 daily in lost revenue and can jeopardize regulatory approvals.[6] Conversely, high-performing CRO partnerships accelerate enrollment, enhance data quality, and improve return on investment through streamlined operational execution. The most successful collaborations function as true extensions of the sponsor's internal team, emphasizing shared risk ownership and patient-centric trial designs.

The Full-Service CRO Value Proposition for Emerging Sponsors

Emerging biotech and medtech companies represent one of the most dynamic segments of the pharmaceutical ecosystem. They drive a disproportionate share of pipeline innovation, particularly in specialty indications, rare diseases, and novel modalities. Yet they operate under constraints that fundamentally shape their CRO requirements.

Capital Efficiency as a Design Constraint

Unlike large pharmaceutical sponsors, emerging companies typically operate within discrete funding cycles. Each clinical milestone, whether IND acceptance, Phase I completion, or pivotal trial enrollment, is a capital event that determines whether the company survives to reach the next stage. In this context, the CRO is not merely executing a trial; it is helping the sponsor navigate the relationship between clinical progress and financial viability.

A full-service CRO that understands this dynamic can structure engagements to align with the sponsor's funding milestones, sequence activities to preserve capital during critical periods, and provide strategic advice on which data packages will be most persuasive to investors and regulators. This is not a service that can be delivered by a vendor operating from a standard scope of work.

The Integration Advantage

For sponsors managing their first or second clinical program, the coordination burden of working with multiple specialized vendors (one for regulatory consulting, another for clinical monitoring, a third for data management, a fourth for biostatistics) can be overwhelming. Each interface introduces communication gaps, conflicting timelines, and accountability ambiguity.

A full-service CRO eliminates these interfaces. When the same organization manages regulatory strategy, protocol development, clinical operations, data management, biostatistics, and medical monitoring, the result is not merely operational convenience. It is structural coherence: regulatory feedback informs protocol amendments in real time, enrollment data shapes statistical planning, and safety signals are assessed within the full context of the program rather than in isolation.

> The most consequential decisions in clinical development are made before the first patient is enrolled. A CRO that arrives after these decisions are finalized is inheriting risk, not managing it.

End-to-End Clinical Development: From IND Through Approval

The end-to-end development model is the operational expression of the strategic partnership. It means the CRO is engaged across the full continuum of clinical development, not as a collection of functional services activated sequentially, but as an integrated development organization that maintains program continuity from initial regulatory strategy through post-marketing commitments.

IND Strategy and Regulatory Pathway Design

The IND submission is the first and often most consequential regulatory interaction in a program's lifecycle. For emerging sponsors, the quality of the IND package determines not only whether the program proceeds but also the agency's confidence in the sponsor's development capability. A CRO engaged at this stage contributes to preclinical data packaging, CMC strategy alignment, clinical protocol design, and the regulatory narrative that frames the development rationale. For global programs, this includes parallel engagement with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the European Medicines Agency, the Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency in Japan, and other regional authorities.

Protocol Design and Feasibility

Protocol design is where scientific ambition meets operational reality. A well-designed protocol balances scientific rigor with practical feasibility: enrollment criteria that are appropriately inclusive, visit schedules that patients can sustain, endpoints that regulators will accept, and a sample size that is statistically adequate without being operationally unreachable. Industry analyses consistently demonstrate that adoption of innovative trial design methodologies and predictive biomarkers improves composite success rates.[7] These gains are not achieved through operational efficiency alone; they reflect better upfront design decisions.

Clinical Execution and Adaptive Oversight

During trial conduct, the strategic CRO partner provides more than monitoring and data collection. It provides adaptive oversight: continuous assessment of enrollment trends, site performance, data quality metrics, and safety signals, with the authority and scientific judgment to recommend course corrections before problems escalate. This requires a team model where the project lead has clinical and regulatory context, not merely operational training.

Data Analysis, Reporting, and Regulatory Submission

The transition from data lock to regulatory submission is often where programs lose momentum. When biostatistics, medical writing, and regulatory affairs operate as independent functional groups, the submission package becomes a compilation rather than a coherent narrative. In an end-to-end partnership, the regulatory submission is the product of a team that has been involved since IND strategy, understands the agency's expectations from prior interactions, and can craft a data presentation that addresses the questions regulators are most likely to ask.

Building Sponsor Confidence Through Operational Transparency

Trust is not built through contractual language. It is built through operational behavior. The single most important determinant of sponsor confidence in a CRO partnership is transparency: the willingness to share information, including unfavorable information, in real time, without filtering or delay.

The Transparency Deficit

In transactional outsourcing relationships, information asymmetry is structural. The CRO possesses operational data, site-level intelligence, and execution insights that the sponsor depends upon but cannot independently verify. When the CRO manages this information as a proprietary asset, revealing favorable data and contextualizing unfavorable data, the sponsor operates with an incomplete picture. This dynamic erodes trust over time, particularly when enrollment shortfalls, site performance issues, or data quality concerns emerge as surprises rather than as known risks being actively managed.

Structural Mechanisms for Transparency

Building genuine transparency requires more than good intentions. It requires structural mechanisms embedded in the operating model:

- Real-time data dashboards. Sponsors should have continuous access to enrollment metrics, site activation timelines, query rates, protocol deviation trends, and safety data. These dashboards should not be curated summaries; they should reflect the same operational data the CRO's internal teams use to manage the program.
- Joint risk registers. Risk identification and mitigation should be a shared exercise, with both sponsor and CRO contributing to a living risk register that is reviewed at every governance meeting. The CRO should be expected to identify risks proactively, not defensively.
- Proactive escalation protocols. The governance framework should define clear thresholds for escalation, specifying which operational deviations trigger immediate notification and which are managed through routine reporting channels.
- Performance-linked contracting. Financial structures that align CRO compensation with program milestones, rather than activity volumes, create natural incentives for transparency. When the CRO's financial performance depends on program success, the motivation to conceal problems diminishes.

Case Perspectives: Complex Programs That Demand Partnership

The strategic partnership model is not equally relevant across all development contexts. It becomes essential when the program involves scientific complexity, regulatory uncertainty, or operational challenges that exceed the capacity of a transactional outsourcing arrangement. Three therapeutic contexts illustrate this dynamic.

Rare Disease Programs

Rare disease development represents the clearest case for strategic CRO partnership. Patient populations are small, geographically dispersed, and often diagnosed late. Natural history data may be incomplete. Regulatory pathways frequently rely on accelerated or conditional approval mechanisms that demand close and early engagement with regulatory authorities. The CRO must contribute not only to trial execution but to disease understanding, endpoint validation, and the development of patient identification strategies that are specific to the condition.

In rare disease, the margin for error in protocol design is effectively zero. A sample size miscalculation, an endpoint that regulators do not accept, or an inclusion criterion that inadvertently excludes the majority of the patient population can end a program. The CRO partner must bring experience across multiple rare disease programs and the scientific judgment to navigate regulatory interactions where precedent is limited.

Wound Care and Regenerative Medicine Trials

Wound care clinical trials present unique operational and regulatory challenges that generic CRO capabilities cannot address. Endpoint assessment in chronic wound healing, including metrics such as complete wound closure, wound area reduction, and time to healing, requires standardized wound measurement methodologies, investigator training in consistent assessment techniques, and adjudication frameworks that minimize measurement variability. The regulatory framework spans both drug and device pathways, depending on the product classification, adding regulatory complexity that demands cross-functional expertise.

Oncology Partnerships

Oncology remains the largest single therapeutic area in clinical development, accounting for approximately 30 to 31 percent of all outsourced clinical trial activity.[8] The complexity of oncology programs, including molecularly defined patient populations, combination regimens, companion diagnostics, and evolving regulatory expectations around surrogate endpoints and real-world evidence, requires a CRO partner with deep oncology expertise across the full development continuum. In oncology, where the vast majority of trials require at least one protocol amendment, the ability to anticipate and mitigate design-related issues before they cascade into costly delays is a core competency of the strategic partner.

The Mid-Size CRO Advantage in Complex Therapeutic Areas

> Scale is not strategy. The question is not how many countries a CRO operates in, but whether the team assigned to your program has the scientific depth and operational authority to make decisions that matter.

The consolidation wave that has reshaped the CRO landscape has created a market with a clear structural gap. At one end, a small number of mega-CROs offer global scale, standardized processes, and integrated technology platforms. At the other, niche specialty providers offer deep expertise in narrow functional areas or therapeutic domains. In between, mid-size full-service CROs occupy a position that, for many sponsors, represents the optimal balance of capability, responsiveness, and scientific engagement.

Empirical Evidence of the Mid-Size Advantage

The evidence for mid-size CRO performance advantages is not anecdotal. A 2024 industry benchmarking study surveying 140 pharmaceutical and biotech decision-makers found that mid-size CROs outperformed large CROs across the majority of clinical development services.[9]

Table 3. Sponsor Satisfaction by CRO Size (Worldwide Clinical Trials / ISR Benchmarking, 2024)

Clinical Development Service	Mid-Size CRO Satisfaction	Large CRO Satisfaction
Project Management	82%	67%
Study Reporting	76%	72%
Study Design	74%	69%
Site Selection	73%	71%
Site Start-up	73%	69%
Patient Recruitment	72%	69%
Regulatory Services	74%	76%
Data Management	74%	76%
Quality Assurance	71%	71%

The 15-percentage-point advantage in project management is particularly significant. Project management quality is the single strongest predictor of overall sponsor satisfaction, and it is in this dimension that the mid-size CRO model's structural advantages, including lower staff turnover, greater team continuity, and more accessible leadership, are most apparent.

Structural Advantages of the Mid-Size Model

- Team stability and continuity. Mid-size CROs typically experience lower project management turnover than their larger counterparts. When the same project director, medical monitor, and data management lead remain on a program from start to finish, institutional knowledge is preserved and sponsor confidence is maintained.
- Leadership accessibility. In a mid-size CRO, the sponsor's program team has direct access to senior leadership, including the President or Chief Scientific Officer, when strategic decisions are required. In mega-CROs, this access is typically mediated through layers of management that dilute both urgency and context.
- Operational agility. Mid-size organizations can adapt their processes, team structures, and governance models to the specific needs of each program without the institutional friction of enterprise-wide standardization. This agility is particularly valuable in complex therapeutic areas where no two programs follow the same template.
- Cultural alignment with emerging sponsors. The working culture of a mid-size CRO, characterized by entrepreneurial mindset, lean decision-making, and personal accountability, often aligns more naturally with the culture of emerging biotech and medtech companies than the corporate culture of a global CRO platform.

Challenges and Strategic Considerations

The strategic partnership model is not without challenges. Organizations that pursue it must confront structural, cultural, and operational complexities that the transactional model avoids.

Alignment of Incentives

Strategic partnerships require financial structures that align CRO incentives with sponsor outcomes. Traditional fee-for-service models create perverse incentives: the CRO generates more revenue when the program takes longer or requires more resources. Moving toward milestone-based, risk-sharing, or outcome-linked pricing is conceptually straightforward but operationally complex. Both parties must agree on milestone definitions, risk allocation, and the financial consequences of success and failure.

Governance Complexity

Deeper integration creates more governance surface area. Joint steering committees, risk registers, escalation protocols, and shared decision-making frameworks require investment in governance infrastructure that transactional relationships do not demand. For emerging sponsors with limited management bandwidth, this governance burden can be significant. The CRO must be prepared to take the lead in establishing and maintaining governance frameworks, rather than expecting the sponsor to define the operating model.

Talent and Capability Requirements

Strategic partnerships demand a different talent profile than transactional outsourcing. CRO staff must be capable of strategic thinking, not merely task execution. Project directors must understand regulatory strategy. Medical monitors must engage scientifically with the sponsor's medical team. Data managers must think in terms of submission requirements, not merely database specifications. Building and retaining this talent requires investment in training, career development, and compensation structures that compete with sponsor-side opportunities.

Scalability of the Mid-Size Model

The mid-size CRO advantage is real, but it is not unlimited. Mid-size organizations must be deliberate about their growth strategy, accepting that the qualities that make them effective (team stability, leadership accessibility, and cultural alignment) can be diluted by rapid expansion. The mid-size CRO's competitive position depends on maintaining the intimacy and scientific depth that distinguish it from the mega-CRO platforms, even as it grows.

> These challenges are real, but they are not reasons to retreat to the transactional model. They are reasons to build the partnership model with intentionality and discipline.

Recommendations

Drawing on two decades of clinical development leadership, I offer the following recommendations for both sponsors and CROs seeking to build partnerships that deliver strategic value beyond outsourcing:

Engage Your CRO Before the Protocol Is Written

The most consequential development decisions are made earliest. Sponsors should involve their CRO partner in IND strategy, regulatory pathway design, and clinical development planning, not merely in protocol execution. Early engagement reduces downstream risk and aligns the entire program team around a shared development vision.

Select for Scientific Depth, Not Just Operational Scale

When evaluating CRO partners, prioritize therapeutic expertise, team quality, and project management continuity over headcount, site network size, or geographic footprint. The benchmarking data are clear: mid-size CROs with deep scientific engagement consistently outperform larger organizations on the metrics that matter most to sponsors.

Structure Contracts Around Outcomes, Not Activities

Move beyond unit-based pricing to financial structures that align CRO incentives with program milestones. Risk-sharing models, performance-linked bonuses, and gain-sharing arrangements create the financial framework for genuine partnership.

Demand Operational Transparency as a Contractual Requirement

Real-time access to operational data should not be a courtesy; it should be a contractual term. Sponsors should require shared dashboards, joint risk registers, and defined escalation thresholds as conditions of the partnership.

Invest in Governance Infrastructure

Effective partnerships require more than good intentions. Establish joint steering committees with defined decision authority, regular governance cadences, and clear accountability for both strategic and operational decisions.

Evaluate Cultural Fit as Rigorously as Capability

The most technically capable CRO will underperform if its working culture is misaligned with the sponsor's. Emerging biotech companies should seek CRO partners whose decision-making speed, risk tolerance, and communication style match their own.

Build for the Long Term

The strategic partnership model delivers its greatest value over multiple programs and years. Sponsors should evaluate CRO partners not only for the current program but for the development arc, from first-in-human through pivotal trial and regulatory submission. Long-term partnerships compound institutional knowledge and eliminate the onboarding costs that erode efficiency in transactional relationships.

Conclusion

The CRO industry is at an inflection point. The market has never been larger, the science has never been more complex, and the sponsors driving the majority of pipeline innovation have never been more dependent on external development partners. Yet the dominant model of CRO engagement, transactional outsourcing, was designed for a different era, one in which sponsors maintained large internal development organizations and CROs served primarily as capacity extensions.

That era is ending. The emerging biotech and medtech companies that now drive the pipeline need CRO partners that think like drug developers, contribute strategic judgment from the earliest stages of program design, and operate with the transparency and accountability that genuine partnership demands. The CROs that will lead in this environment are those that invest in scientific depth, team quality, and governance infrastructure, rather than relying solely on scale and standardization.

Having led clinical development programs across oncology, rare diseases, wound care, infectious diseases, CNS disorders, and cardiovascular research, I can affirm that the programs that succeed are not the ones with the most resources. They are the ones with the strongest alignment between sponsor vision and execution capability. Building that alignment is the work of partnership, not procurement.

> “The CRO is no longer a vendor. It is a strategic partner. And the quality of that partnership determines who reaches the patient first.

Kush Dhody, M.D., M.S.
President, Amarex Clinical Research, LLC (An NSF Company)
Physician-Scientist | Clinical Development Executive | Regulatory Strategy Advisor
kushdhody.com

References

1. MarketsandMarkets. "Contract Research Organization Market, Global Forecast to 2029." 2024. https://www.marketsandmarkets.com/Market-Reports/contract-research-organization-market-200382873.html

2. ClinicalTrialsArena / GlobalData. "CRO M&A Activity Report: 50 Deals Completed in 2021." https://www.clinicaltrialsarena.com/analysis/cro-mergers-and-acquisitions/

3. Argo Advisory. "Are CROs Good Strategic Investments in 2024?" 2024. https://argo-advisory.com/powerhouses-behind-pharma-and-biotech-innovations/

4. PPD / Thermo Fisher Scientific. "CRO Industry Report." Contract Pharma. June 2024. https://www.ppd.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Contract-Pharma-2024.06-CRO.pdf

5. Research and Markets. "Clinical Trials Outsourcing Market, Focused Insights 2024–2029." 2024. https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2024/12/31/3003065/28124/en/

6. PPD / Thermo Fisher Scientific. "A Game Changer in Biotech: Engaging a CRO Partner Early." 2024. https://www.ppd.com/blog/early-engagement-cro-partner-game-changer-emerging-biotech/

7. IQVIA Institute. "Global Trends in R&D 2024: Activity, Productivity, and Enablers." February 2024. https://www.iqvia.com/insights/the-iqvia-institute/reports-and-publications/reports/global-trends-in-r-and-d-2024

8. Grand View Research. "Healthcare Contract Research Organization Market Report, 2024." https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/contract-research-organization-cro-market

9. Worldwide Clinical Trials / ISR. "The Midsize Advantage: An Assessment of Project Management and Clinical Development Services." May 2024. https://www.worldwide.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/The-Midsize-Advantage-Report_May2024_VF.pdf

10. Canaccord Genuity. "H1 2024 CRO M&A and Sector Update." 2024. https://www.canaccordgenuity.com/49eff0/globalassets/capital-markets/documents/newsletters/cro/cg-cro-market-update-h1-2024.pdf

11. Fortrea. "Biotech Challenges and the Crucial Role of CRO Partnerships." 2024. https://www.fortrea.com/sites/default/files/2025-09/Biotech-challenges-crucial-role-of-cro-partnerships.pdf

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this white paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of Amarex Clinical Research, LLC (An NSF Company) or any regulatory authority. This document is intended for informational and educational purposes and should not be construed as regulatory, legal, or compliance advice.

© 2024 Kush Dhody. All rights reserved.

This white paper may be shared and cited with appropriate attribution to the author. For permissions beyond citation or excerpting, please contact the author.