JUMO HEALTH WHITE PAPER

Beyond Eligibility: Patient Readiness Will Define the Future of Clinical Trials.

Clinical research has become better at finding eligible patients. The next performance advantage is knowing who is prepared to engage, consent, persist, and complete.

By John Seaner
Executive Vice President, Innovation & GTM
August 2026

The industry has spent decades improving the precision of patient identification. Yet clinical trial performance still breaks between qualification and completion because the system measures whether patients can enter, then assumes they are ready to remain.

That assumption creates a critical blind spot. A patient can be clinically eligible, interested in the study, responsive to outreach, and willing to consent while remaining unprepared for the practical, emotional, cognitive, and behavioral demands of participation.

When those demands become real, the trial sees a failed screen, a delayed decision, a missed visit, a protocol deviation, or a withdrawal. The patient experiences something different: confusion, fear, burden, uncertainty, or a commitment that no longer fits daily life.

Patient readiness connects those two realities. It gives sponsors a way to understand whether participation is viable before risk becomes visible in traditional trial metrics.

The missing layer between eligibility and completion.

Eligibility is indispensable, but narrow by design. It establishes clinical fit against a protocol. It does not establish whether the patient understands the study, trusts the process, can manage the logistics, has the necessary support, or can sustain the required behaviors over time.

Readiness is the patient's capacity to make an informed participation decision and carry that decision through the study. It is the operational condition that determines whether clinical fit can become durable progression.

> A patient can be informed without being ready.
>
> A patient can be interested without being able to participate.

This is why patient readiness is different from engagement. Engagement records an interaction: an opened message, a completed form, an answered call, or a site visit. Readiness describes a state. It reflects whether understanding, confidence, feasibility, support, and commitment are strong enough for the next step.

Readiness has five connected dimensions.

Participation rarely breaks for one reason. Readiness emerges from several human conditions that reinforce or undermine one another.

Cognitive readiness.

Does the patient understand the purpose of the study, the uncertainty involved, the procedures required, the possible tradeoffs, and what participation will mean in daily life? Comprehension must extend beyond the ability to repeat information. The patient must be able to apply it to a personal decision.

Emotional readiness.

Is fear overwhelming the patient's ability to evaluate the opportunity? Is trust strong enough for uncertainty? Does the patient feel pressure to say yes, or confidence in the decision? Emotional conditions shape how information is received and whether commitment can survive difficult moments.

Practical readiness.

Can the patient manage travel, scheduling, work, family obligations, financial strain, treatment burden, and the duration of participation? Motivation cannot compensate indefinitely for a study that does not fit the patient's life.

Social readiness.

Does the patient have the caregiver, family, clinical, and community support the study requires? In many trials, a caregiver is not peripheral. That person is part of the participation infrastructure. Excluding them from preparation leaves a major readiness variable unmanaged.

Behavioral readiness.

Can intention become repeated action? Trial participation requires patients to attend, remember, report, adhere, tolerate, and continue. Behavioral readiness reflects whether the routines and supports required for those actions can be established and maintained.

These dimensions are connected. Confusion can create fear. Fear can delay action. Logistical strain can weaken confidence. Caregiver fatigue can make an otherwise motivated patient unable to continue. Readiness must therefore be understood as a system, not a single score or one-time questionnaire.

A readiness-based progression model.

A stronger trial operating model separates five questions that are often compressed into one funnel:

Medical eligibility	Does the patient meet the protocol's clinical criteria?
Access feasibility	Can the patient realistically reach and use the study opportunity?
Patient readiness	Does the patient understand, trust, and feel able to participate?
Progression quality	Is advancement based on durable intent and resolved friction?

Completion	Does readiness remain strong enough through the final required visit?

This progression changes the objective. The goal is no longer to move the greatest possible volume to the next stage. It is to advance the right patients with the preparation and support required for participation to hold.

That distinction protects patients as well as trial performance. A readiness-based model can strengthen a well-informed yes. It can also reveal when declining is the right decision. Both outcomes are better than premature progression followed by confusion or withdrawal.

Readiness changes over time.

A patient who is ready at referral may be less ready at consent. A participant who begins with strong commitment may become vulnerable after the first difficult procedure, an unexpected treatment effect, a change in caregiver support, or months of accumulating logistical burden.

Readiness should therefore be created, validated, reinforced, and monitored across the lifecycle. Each transition creates a new decision environment:

1. Awareness requires relevance and trust.
1. Screening requires clarity and practical feasibility.
1. Consent requires informed expectation alignment.
1. Enrollment requires a sustainable participation plan.
1. Retention requires ongoing reinforcement and early risk detection.
1. Completion requires support through the final required milestone.

Traditional metrics usually identify the final behavior. Readiness intelligence looks for the conditions developing underneath it. That creates time to intervene while the issue is still correctable.

What a readiness operating model changes.

Making readiness operational requires more than empathetic content or additional reminders. It requires a connected model of education, orchestration, and intelligence.

Measure before advancement.

Qualification should be accompanied by a clear view of comprehension, confidence, burden, support, and practical fit. The next step should be earned by readiness evidence, not triggered by funnel pressure alone.

Intervene against the actual friction.

Different barriers require different responses. A patient who lacks information needs education. A patient who understands but fears the procedure needs emotional preparation. A patient facing transportation or caregiver constraints needs practical support. Generic outreach treats unlike problems as though they were the same.

Prepare the site handoff.

Sites should receive more than contact information and eligibility signals. They should understand what the patient knows, what remains unresolved, who influences the decision, and what support may be required. Better preparation makes screening and consent conversations more productive.

Monitor readiness decay.

Risk should be reassessed as participation continues. Changes in engagement, questions, burden, confidence, logistics, and caregiver conditions can reveal deterioration before a missed visit or withdrawal makes the problem obvious.

> Readiness is built before enrollment.
>
> It is protected through completion.

The operational value is predictability.

Readiness governance is often described as a patient-experience improvement. It is also an execution discipline. When sponsors can distinguish clinical fit from participation readiness, they gain a more credible view of funnel quality and completion exposure.

That visibility can improve site handoffs, reduce repetitive education, expose preventable friction earlier, and make retention intervention more precise. Recruitment spending is judged by productive participation rather than raw activity. Forecasts are informed by leading conditions instead of retrospective outcomes.

The economic logic follows. Every avoidable withdrawal carries the cost of the original identification, recruitment, screening, and enrollment effort, then adds replacement activity, site rework, timeline risk, and rescue spending. Cost per completer is a more meaningful measure than cost per lead or cost per enrollment because it connects patient progression to the outcome the trial actually needs.

The future is readiness-led.

Patient identification will continue to improve. Real-world data, AI, and more precise clinical matching will make eligible populations easier to locate. But accelerating identification without strengthening readiness can simply move unresolved risk downstream faster.

The future of trial performance depends on connecting intelligence with human preparation: finding the right patient, understanding the conditions that will shape participation, resolving friction before advancement, and protecting readiness as the study continues.

Eligibility determines who can enter. Patient readiness will increasingly determine which trials can complete predictably.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

John Seaner

Executive Vice President, Innovation & GTM

John brings 30 years of experience building categories, products, brands, and growth engines around emerging technology, including executive leadership roles at Medidata, conversationHEALTH, and Swoop. At Jumo, he helps define patient readiness as measurable infrastructure for recruitment, retention, completion, and more credible forecasting.