Scilight

Translational Insights

https://www.sciltp.com/journals/ti

Commentary

A First-Principles Framework for Accelerating Translational Medicine

Edward Clay [1,2] and Annette Marleau [1,*]

[1] Translational and Advanced Medical (TAM) Global, Nashville, TN 37011, USA
[2] Cellular Performance Institute (CPI), Tijuana 22504, Baja California, Mexico
* Correspondence: annette.marleau@thetamcenter.com

How To Cite: Clay, E.; Marleau, A. A First-Principles Framework for Accelerating Translational Medicine. *Translational Insights* **2026**, *1*(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.53941/ti.2026.100009

Received: 24 April 2026
Revised: 11 May 2026
Accepted: 29 June 2026
Published: 3 July 2026

Abstract: Drug development is often constrained by development timelines that can extend 10–15 years from discovery to clinical implementation. While these timelines are intended to ensure safety and rigor, they frequently conflict with the urgency faced by patients with life-threatening diseases. A first-principles approach to translational medicine challenges the assumption that current development systems are inevitable and instead reexamines how such systems might be designed if built from fundamental biological, economic, and clinical realities. By deconstructing traditional development models into their basic components, opportunities emerge to redesign the translational ecosystem around speed of learning, integrated capabilities, and alignment with patient need. This perspective explores how integrated research environments, proximity between clinicians and scientists, and intelligent engagement with global regulatory frameworks can accelerate the translation of scientific insight into clinical impact. Ultimately, rethinking the architecture of translational medicine may be as important as advances in biology itself in determining how quickly new therapies reach patients.

Keywords: translational medicine; first-principles; clinical development

1. Introduction

A fundamental question underlies modern translational medicine: *why should a patient wait 10 to 15 years for a therapy to become available when they may not have 10 to 15 months to live* [1]*?* This is not merely a question of efficiency; it is a question of alignment between the pace of medical innovation and the reality of human disease [2]. For many patients, the limiting factor is not scientific possibility, but time. Yet the systems we rely on to develop and deliver therapies remain structured around timelines that reflect process, not urgency.

Despite extraordinary advances in biomedical science, the prevailing model of therapeutic development remains constrained by long timelines, high costs, and fragmented execution [2]. Studies on translational research suggest that scientific discoveries often require approximately 17 years to be incorporated into routine clinical practice, although estimates vary depending on the domain, endpoint, and methodology used to measure translational lag [1]. Even within the formal drug development pathway itself, timelines remain substantial. Analyses of industry-wide development programs estimate that the discovery and development of a new molecular entity require approximately 13.5 years on average from discovery through clinical trials and regulatory approval [3]. Importantly, this estimate does not include the time required to identify and validate therapeutic targets. Within this framework, the early discovery and preclinical stages alone can require more than 5 years before a therapy reaches first-in-human clinical trials [3]. Recent analyses report a median clinical development time of approximately 8.3 years between initiation of clinical testing and marketing authorization for innovative drugs [4], underscoring the substantial duration of the clinical phase of development.

These extended timelines for translating scientific discoveries into therapies are accompanied by substantial financial investment. Estimates based on publicly available financial and clinical trial data suggest that the median capitalized research and development investment required to bring a new drug to market is approximately $985 million, with a mean estimate of roughly $1.34 billion after accounting for failed development programs [5]. Costs vary considerably by therapeutic area; in the same analysis, median estimates ranged from approximately $766 million for nervous system agents to $2.77 billion for oncology and immunomodulating drugs. In another study that was performed using industry survey data, the out-of-pocket research and development expenditures per approved new drug were estimated at approximately $1.4 billion. A systematic review of drug development costs reported a wide range of capitalized pre-launch R&D estimates, from approximately $161 million to $4.54 billion per new molecular entity depending on therapeutic area and analytical approach [6]. Taken together, these studies illustrate the extraordinary financial resources required to translate biomedical discoveries into approved therapies, a burden that persists across therapeutic areas and development pathways. In turn, these disproportionate costs result in novel concepts failures because of insufficient funding to reach the clinical testing rather than scientific potential. Increasingly, investors are skeptical primarily because the exceptionally high-risk, expensive, and often require long timelines before any potential return on investment.

While these drug development processes are designed to ensure rigorous demonstrations of safety and efficacy, they are often misaligned with the urgency faced by patients with life-threatening conditions. For individuals with rapidly progressing cancers, neurodegenerative disorders, or rare genetic conditions, therapeutic timelines measured in decades can be incompatible with the natural course of illness. Even when promising biological insights emerge, the structure of the development pathway frequently prevents rapid translation into clinical evaluation. As a result, many potentially valuable discoveries remain confined to laboratory settings for years before they can be tested in patients.

A first-principles approach challenges the assumption that the current system is the only viable model. Rather than focusing solely on incremental improvements within the existing framework, first-principles thinking asks a more fundamental question: if we were designing a translational system from the ground up based on biological realities, development timelines, economic constraints, and the needs of patients, how would it be structured?

2. A First-Principles View of Translational Medicine

First principles thinking requires deconstructing complex systems into their most basic components and rebuilding them from foundational truths rather than inherited assumptions. In translational medicine, this means questioning why processes are structured the way they are, why development is linear, why capabilities are fragmented, and why timelines remain so extended despite advances in technology. When viewed through this lens, many features of the traditional system are not inevitable; they are historical artifacts. Fragmentation across discovery, diagnostics, manufacturing, and clinical care introduces latency and cost. Linear development delays feedback and slows learning. Geographic and regulatory assumptions constrain flexibility. Together, these factors create a system that is optimized for process, but not necessarily for speed of insight or patient access. If instead the system is rebuilt from first principles, prioritizing speed of learning, data fidelity, cost efficiency, and alignment with patient outcomes, the resulting architecture looks fundamentally different.

3. Rethinking System Design

A first-principles approach leads naturally toward integration. The ideal translational research process integrates laboratory discovery and patient care combining specialized infrastructures with cross-disciplinary expertise in a patient-centric environment [7]. Rather than distributing capabilities across multiple independent entities, key functions, research, diagnostics, data science, manufacturing, imaging, pharmacy, and clinical care are aligned within a unified ecosystem. This reduces inter-organizational friction, eliminates many forms of outsourcing, and enables continuous data flow across the translational pipeline.

Equally important is proximity. When clinicians and scientists operate within the same environment, translation is no longer a delayed handoff but a continuous process. Tissue obtained in an interventional procedure can be immediately transferred for genomic, proteomic, and pathological analysis. Insights generated in the laboratory can inform clinical decision-making in real time. The traditional gaps between bench and bedside are not bridged; they are removed.

This co-location of capabilities compresses feedback loops, transforming translational medicine into a high-velocity learning system. Instead of waiting months for data to be processed and be returned from external laboratories or collaborators, teams can iterate rapidly, refining hypotheses and adjusting therapeutic strategies as

new information emerges. The result is not only faster development, but a fundamentally different relationship between science and clinical care.

An integrated ecosystem also produces substantial efficiencies. Processes that are typically distributed across multiple vendors and institutions can be executed within a coordinated framework, reducing cost and complexity. While such systems may require greater upfront investment, they enable sustained reductions in operational expense and allow significantly more work to be performed within the same resource envelope.

4. Rethinking Regulation and Global Development

A first-principles approach not only redefines how translational systems are built, but also how they interact with regulatory frameworks.

A first-principles approach to translational medicine does not assume that innovation must originate and progress within a single regulatory system. Instead, it evaluates global sources of clinical signal and aligns them with regulatory environments that enable rapid, ethical validation. This perspective recognizes that therapeutic innovation is inherently global. Promising approaches may emerge in different countries under different regulatory conditions. Rather than duplicating early-stage work within a single jurisdiction, these signals can be identified, evaluated, and integrated into a structured development pathway. In this context, regulation is not viewed as a fixed sequence, but as a set of constraints within which systems can be intelligently designed. Different regulatory environments offer varying degrees of flexibility for early-phase clinical investigation. By operating within fully licensed and compliant frameworks, it becomes possible to accelerate early validation while maintaining appropriate standards of safety and quality.

Early-phase data generated in such environments can then inform engagement with regulatory agencies in other jurisdictions, including the United States. In some cases, larger and more informative early datasets can support more efficient progression into later-stage trials. Rather than bypassing established systems, this approach complements them by improving the quality and speed of the data entering those systems [8]. Moreover, patient recruitment for clinical trials differs significantly across countries due to specific regulations, cultural attitudes, healthcare infrastructures, and language barriers. For example, patient recruitment in the United States is often hindered by low patient awareness, strict eligibility criteria, and high patient burden related to travel and time constraints. Other major limitations include financial barriers, limited access for rural and underprivileged populations, and fragmented referral patterns. Some of these constraints may be less pronounced in countries with more integrated referral networks or coordinated research infrastructures, which can facilitate more rapid patient enrollment, data collection, and translational learning [9].

5. Patient-Centered Ethics and Access

At the center of this model is a reframing of the patient's role in translational medicine.

In traditional frameworks, patients often encounter innovation only after long development cycles have been completed. For individuals facing life-threatening conditions, this delay may represent a critical limitation. A first-principles approach considers not only safety but also access and timing as core ethical variables.

While informed consent remains essential, this model emphasizes a more participatory concept of informed decision-making. Patients are provided with comprehensive information and are empowered to make choices based on their specific circumstances, including the urgency of their condition and the availability of alternatives. From this perspective, the ethical challenge is not only how to protect patients from risk, but also how to responsibly expand access to potentially beneficial therapies within appropriate clinical frameworks.

6. Emergent Effects: Talent, Alignment, and Innovation

One of the less obvious consequences of a first-principles system is its effect on the people who choose to work within it. Highly experienced scientists and clinicians are often drawn to environments where feedback is immediate, collaboration is direct, and the connection between their work and patient outcomes is visible. When the barriers between disciplines are removed and the pace of learning is accelerated, the system itself becomes a source of motivation.

In such environments, alignment around purpose can become as important as traditional incentives. The opportunity to participate in a system that is designed for rapid translation and real-world impact attracts individuals who are motivated not only by scientific rigor, but by the ability to see that work directly influence patient care. At the same time, the integration of capabilities and compression of timelines allows for more efficient use of resources. By reducing dependency on external processes and minimizing delays, the system enables a greater number of ideas to be tested and refined within a given timeframe.

7. From First Principles to Patient Impact

The future of translational medicine will not be defined solely by advances in biology, but by how effectively systems are designed to translate those advances into patient outcomes, and how quickly they can do so when time is the most constrained variable [2]. A first-principles approach offers a framework for rethinking the medical development ecosystem: one that prioritizes speed of learning, integration of capabilities, and alignment with patient need. Rather than incrementally improving existing models, it challenges the assumptions that define them.

In doing so, it suggests that the most meaningful advances in medicine may come not only from new therapies, but from new ways of building the systems that bring those therapies to patients—and from the willingness to question whether the timelines we have accepted are truly justified in the face of urgent human need. Ultimately, the question is not whether we can move faster, but whether we are willing to redesign the system so that speed, access, and patient reality become the starting point rather than the constraint.

Author Contributions

E.C. conceptualized the manuscript. E.C. and A.M. wrote the manuscript. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

No data were created or analyzed in this study.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors Edward Clay and Annette Marleau are affiliated with the company Translational and Advanced Medical (TAM) Global, and the author Edward Clay is also affiliated with the company Cellular Performance Institute (CPI). The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Use of AI and AI-Assisted Technologies

No AI tools were utilized for this paper.

References

1. Morris, Z.S.; Wooding, S.; Grant, J. The answer is 17 years, what is the question: Understanding time lags in translational research. *J. R. Soc. Med.* **2011**, *104*, 510–520. https://doi.org/10.1258/jrsm.2011.110180.
2. Liang, Y.; Marincola, F.M. Translational Insights: A Paradigm Reversal in Translational Research. *Transl. Insights* **2026**, *1*, 1.
3. Paul, S.M.; Mytelka, D.S.; Dunwiddie, C.T.; et al. How to improve R&D productivity: The pharmaceutical industry's grand challenge. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **2010**, *9*, 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3078.
4. Brown, D.G.; Wobst, H.J.; Kapoor, A.; et al. Clinical development times for innovative drugs. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **2022**, *21*, 793–794. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41573-021-00190-9.
5. Wouters, O.J.; McKee, M.; Luyten, J. Estimated Research and Development Investment Needed to Bring a New Medicine to Market, 2009-2018. *JAMA* **2020**, *323*, 844–853. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.1166.
6. Schlander, M.; Hernandez-Villafuerte, K.; Cheng, C.Y.; et al. How Much Does It Cost to Research and Develop a New Drug? A Systematic Review and Assessment. *Pharmacoeconomics* **2021**, *39*, 1243–1269. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-021-01065-y.
7. Boccardi, M. Translational process. *J. Transl. Med.* **2023**, *21*, 677. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12967-023-04507-7.

8. Minisman, G.; Bhanushali, M.; Conwit, R.; et al. Implementing clinical trials on an international platform: Challenges and perspectives. *J. Neurol. Sci.* **2012**, *313*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2011.10.004.
9. Hung, M.; Mohajeri, A.; Almpani, K.; et al. Successes and Challenges in Clinical Trial Recruitment: The Experience of a New Study Team. *Med. Sci.* **2024**, *12*, 39. https://doi.org/10.3390/medsci12030039.