

2026 ACTA Trial of the Year Awards

Nomination form

Nominator details

1. Full name
2. Email address

Award category

3. I have read the award guidelines and believe this trial is eligible to be considered for (please tick all that apply)

- ACTA Trial of the Year Award ONLY
- ACTA Trial of the Year Award AND ACTA STInG Excellence in Trial Statistics Award
- HEAT Excellence in Trial Based Health Economics Award
- ACTA Trial of the Year Award AND ACTA TRIPSIG Excellence in Implementation Science Award
- ACTA Consumer Involvement Award ONLY
- ACTA Clinical Quality Registry Award ONLY
- ACTA TRIPSIG Excellence in Implementation Science Award ONLY

4. I wish to nominate a:

- Clinical trial
- Registry

5. Scientific name of the trial

6. Short name or acronym of the trial

7. ACTA member network or group that designed and led the trial

8. Please upload a copy of the publication confirming the primary trial results

ACTA Trial of the Year Award

9. Do you wish to nominate this trial for the Trial of the Year Award?

10. Chief Investigator full name

11. Chief Investigator email

12. Chief Investigator mobile phone number

13. Please confirm that the trial meets the following eligibility criteria:

- Collaboratively developed
- Multi-centre
- Investigator-driven

- Randomised controlled
- Primary results published (online or in print) in 2025

14. Did this trial involve any commercial or industry collaboration?

15. Please provide a brief summary, including details of any funding or in-kind support, involvement in the trial development, design, conduct and/or analysis

16. Peer summary

Please provide a brief summary (maximum 600 words) describing the trial and why it warrants recognition as the *ACTA Trial of the Year*. Please address each of the judging criteria below:

1. The trial addressed a critical gap in the evidence or a significant innovation in healthcare delivery
2. The quality of the research design, conduct and analysis were outstanding
3. There is a high likelihood that findings from the trial will significantly impact clinical practice and policy and improve outcomes for patients or healthcare delivery.

You may include any relevant publications that support your nomination.

17. Plain English summary

Please provide a brief plain English summary (max 400 words) describing the trial and how the results are likely to impact patients and/or the delivery of healthcare. This should be suitable for publication on the ACTA website and in the general media.

ACTA-STInG Excellence in Trial Statistics Award

18. Do you wish to nominate this trial for the ACTA-STInG Excellence in Trial Statistics Award?

19. Please confirm that the **primary results** of this trial were published (online or in print) in 2025

20. Please confirm that the that the statistical analysis plan is publicly available.

21. Trial Chief Statistician name and statistician group / affiliation / organisation

22. Trial Chief Statistician email

23. Trial Chief Statistician mobile number

24. Statistical methods summary

Please provide a brief summary (600 words max) describing the statistical design and analysis of this trial and why it warrants consideration for the *ACTA STInG Excellence in Trial Statistics Award*.

Please address each of the judging criteria below:

1. The statistical aspects of trial design and planning (sample size, randomisation, analytical methods) were of high quality, appropriate for the research question(s), and documented in a publicly accessible statistical analysis plan following good statistical procedures/practice
2. The statistical analyses were executed as planned and, where not, deviations were transparent, of high quality, and executed well following good statistical procedures/practice
3. The reporting and interpretation of the statistical aspects of the trial were appropriate, transparent, and supported by results from pre-specified analyses and/or well-defended departures from planned procedures following good statistical procedures/practice.

25. Supplemental materials

Please provide the web link/s to the **final version** of the supplemental materials listed below.

1. **Trial Protocol** (for platform trials, please include the core protocol and any relevant domain specific appendix)
2. **Statistical Analysis Plan**

3. **A timeline** describing the date of the registration of the trial in trial registry, date first protocol approved, date first patient, date statistical analysis plan finalised and publicly available, date last patient recruited, date last patient last follow up, date of data lock, date analysis conducted, date of publication

Please ensure it is the final version.

ACTA Consumer Involvement Award

26. Do you wish to nominate this trial for the ACTA Consumer Involvement Award?

27. Consumer Investigator / representative name

28. Consumer Investigator / representative email address (alternatively, please provide the name and email of a senior member of the study team)

29. Consumer involvement value

Describe the value to the study of consumer involvement in this clinical trial's activities and why it warrants consideration for the *ACTA Consumer Involvement Award* (max 600 words). Examples may include experiential knowledge, which is often subjective or qualitative. Consider the criteria below:

1. Consumers were significantly involved in protocol development or design activities
2. Consumer involvement provided valuable and exceptional guidance to the proposed conduct of the trial.

You may include any relevant publications that support your nomination.

30. Plain English summary

Please provide a brief summary (400 words max) describing the benefit of consumer involvement in the trial, including, where appropriate, the consumer's background and motivation for involvement. Plain English summaries should be suitable for publication on the ACTA website and in the general media.

ACTA HEAT Excellence in Trial Based Health Economics Award

31. Do you wish to nominate this trial for the ACTA-HEAT Excellence in Trial Based Health Economics Award?

32. Please confirm that the **health economic analysis of this trial** was published (online or in print) in 2025

33. Lead Health Economist name and health economics group / affiliation / organisation

34. Lead Health Economist email address

35. Lead Health Economist mobile phone number

36. Peer summary

Please describe the health economic analysis and why it warrants consideration for the *ACTA-HEAT Excellence in Trial Based Health Economics Award* (600 words max). Consider the criteria below:

1. The health economics aspects of trial design and planning (e.g. collection and valuation of healthcare use data, patient-reported outcomes) were of high quality, and appropriate for the research question(s)
2. The health economics analyses were executed as planned (e.g. as stated in the Health Economics Analysis Plan (HEAP) and, where not, deviations were transparent, of high quality, and well executed following best practices

3. The reporting and interpretation of the health economic analyses and sensitivity analyses were appropriate, transparent, and supported by results
4. The health economics analyses make a significant contribution to trials methodology, or health and social policy, or health impact.

You may include any relevant publications that support your nomination.

37. Plain English summary

Please provide a plain English summary (400 words max) describing the health economic analysis and how the results are likely to impact patients and/or the delivery of healthcare. Plain English summaries should be suitable for publication on the ACTA website and in the general media.

38. Please upload a copy of the **Health Economics Analysis Plan (HEAP)** and the **economics analysis publication**.

ACTA Clinical Quality Registry Award

39. Do you wish to nominate this trial for the ACTA Clinical Quality Registry Award

ACTA Member Registry

40. Executive Officer, Chairperson, Lead Investigator or equivalent name

41. Executive Officer, Chairperson, Lead Investigator or equivalent email address

42. Executive Officer, Chairperson, Lead Investigator or equivalent mobile phone number

43. Peer summary

Please provide a peer summary (600 words max) describing the registry and why it warrants consideration for the *ACTA Clinical Quality Registry Award*. Consider the criteria below:

1. The governance of the registry: including demonstration of exceptional clinical and technical leadership, effective operational arrangements, the software and management systems in place, compliance with legislation and standards including participant identity controls and quality assurance processes
2. Data quality: including the scope, scale and interoperability of the data, collection in alignment with core outcome sets and/or METEOR metadata standards (where defined), data linkage capacity and effective data analysis
3. Impact: including reporting quality, engagement with relevant stakeholders and end-users of the data; relevant publications and the impact on health outcomes or services (annual reports may be attached as supporting evidence)
4. Consumer involvement: inclusion of consumer representatives and/or advisory committees and the collection of PROMs and/or PREMs (where appropriate)

44. Plain English summary

Please provide a plain English summary (400 words max) describing the registry and how the results have, or are likely to, impact patients and/or the delivery of healthcare. Plain English summaries should be suitable for publication on the ACTA website and in the general media.

45. Supporting documentation

Please provide a copy of any relevant supporting documentation, such as annual report/s and/or high-impact publications. A max of 3 documents will be considered by the judging panel.

ACTA TRIPSIG Excellence in Implementation Science Award

46. Do you wish to nominate this trial for the ACTA TRIPSIG Excellence in Implementation Science Award

47. Please confirm that the primary results of this trial were published (online or in print) in 2025.

48. Lead Implementation Scientist name

49. Lead Implementation Scientist email

50. Lead Implementation Scientist contact number

51. Chief Investigator name

52. Implementation science methods summary

Please provide a brief summary describing the implementation science design and analysis of this trial and why it warrants consideration for the ACTA TRIP SIG Excellence in Trial Implementation Science Award. In addition, please address each of the judging criteria:

The implementation science components of trial design and planning (e.g. theories, models, frameworks, strategy or intervention, outcomes, analytical methods) were of high quality, appropriate for the research question(s), and documented in a publicly accessible location.

The implementation analyses were executed as planned or - where not, deviations were transparent, of high quality, and executed well.

The reporting and interpretation of the implementation science components of the trial were appropriate and transparent

53. Brief plain language summary describing the implementation science strategy used and how the results are likely to impact patients and/or the delivery of healthcare (600 words max)

54. Please upload a copy of the protocol, main results and any secondary publications reporting implementation research design and outcomes, and supplementary material is provided with this nomination form.