APIS

Conference Abstract/Poster/Slides

When the Patient Is the Control: A Pragmatic Framework for Early-Phase Evaluation of Complex, Low-Risk Clinical Interventions

János Körmendy-Rácz [1*]

[1] Hungarian Apitherapy Association, Nagykovácsi, Hungary
[*] Corresponding author email: krj@apiterapia.hu

ABSTRACT

Background

Parallel control groups, particularly within randomized controlled trials, are widely regarded as the gold standard of clinical evidence. While indispensable for confirmatory and high-risk investigations, this paradigm may be ill-suited for early-phase evaluation of complex, multi-component, and low-risk interventions operating within real-world clinical systems.

Objective

This paper proposes a pragmatic methodological framework for evaluating such interventions without reliance on parallel control groups, while maintaining scientific rigor and ethical proportionality.

Methods

We synthesize methodological principles from longitudinal within-subject designs, complex systems theory, and risk-based research ethics. The framework rests on three core pillars: (1) the use of patients as their own controls through stable baseline and pre–post comparisons, (2) black-box, output-oriented validation prioritizing reproducible clinical outcomes over early mechanistic isolation, and (3) safety-first justification grounded in the absence of known adverse effects and low iatrogenic risk.

Results

We demonstrate that, under clearly defined conditions, control-free and within-subject designs can provide valid exploratory evidence, address common methodological criticisms—including placebo effects, natural disease course, and regression to the mean—and serve as a coherent first step in a phased research trajectory.

Conclusion

The absence of a parallel control group does not imply the absence of methodological control. When applied proportionately and transparently, pragmatic, control-free frameworks can generate meaningful, reproducible clinical insights while guiding subsequent mechanistic and controlled investigations. This approach supports methodological pluralism and aligns evidentiary standards with intervention complexity, risk profile, and research objectives.

Keywords: evidence-based medicine; naturopathy; placebo effect; self-controlled study design; randomized controlled trial; pre–post analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are widely regarded as the gold standard of clinical evidence. Their strength lies in isolating causal effects by minimizing bias through randomization and parallel control groups. [1,2] However, this methodological framework was developed primarily for single-component, pharmacological, and higher-risk interventions. When applied uncritically to complex, multi-component, and low-risk interventions, the requirement for a classical control group may become not only impractical but methodologically misleading. [6,7]

In real-world clinical practice, many interventions operate as integrated systems rather than as isolated variables. Behavioral, rehabilitative, educational,

Citation: Körmendy-Rácz J (2025): When the Patient Is the Control: A Pragmatic Framework for Early-Phase Evaluation of Complex, Low-Risk Clinical Interventions, *APIS*, Volumen 2 Issue 2, DOI: 10.62949/02634046.0872218

Received: 30. October 2025.

Accepted: 26. December 2025.

Published: 27. December 2025.

Editorial Note

Editorial handling and peer review of this manuscript were conducted independently of the author's editorial role, in accordance with the journal's standard procedures.

and certain non-invasive therapeutic approaches exert their effects through interacting biological, psychological, and contextual mechanisms. [6,7] In such settings, strict separation of components or the construction of an inert placebo condition may be artificial and may fail to reflect the actual conditions under which the intervention is intended to function. [6]

The aim of this paper is not to argue against controlled research, but to propose a pragmatic methodological framework for early-phase and exploratory evaluation of complex, low-risk clinical interventions. Under well-defined conditions, this framework offers a coherent and scientifically defensible alternative to parallel control group designs, without precluding subsequent confirmatory research. [8,9]

2. The Proposed Pragmatic Control-Free Evaluation Framework (Overview)

The framework proposed in this paper is designed for the early-phase evaluation of complex, low-risk clinical interventions operating within real-world clinical systems. Rather than relying on parallel control groups, methodological control is achieved through the structured integration of longitudinal observation, system-level outcome validation, and explicit risk-based justification. [6,8]

The framework consists of three interdependent pillars:

(1) Within-subject control through stable baselines and longitudinal comparison, whereby each patient serves as their own reference point over time. Control is embedded within the temporal structure of observation rather than between-group allocation.

(2) Black-box, output-oriented validation, in which interventions are evaluated as functional systems based on reproducible clinical outcomes, without requiring early mechanistic isolation of individual components.

(3) Safety-first proportionality, whereby the absence of known serious adverse effects and low iatrogenic risk justifies greater methodological flexibility in exploratory research phases. [6,12,13]

These elements function not as independent alternatives but as a coherent evaluative system. Baseline stability constrains natural fluctuation, reproducible outputs strengthen inferential confidence, and safety considerations define the appropriate evidentiary threshold. [10,12] This perspective is consistent with broader methodological guidance emphasizing the need to adapt evaluative strategies to the complexity and contextual embeddedness of clinical interventions.

The framework is explicitly intended for exploratory, pragmatic, and hypothesis-generating research. It is positioned as an initial phase within a broader research trajectory that may subsequently incorporate mechanistic studies and parallel-group controlled trials where appropriate. [8,9]

2.1 Framework-at-a-Glance: Structural Summary

For clarity, the proposed framework can be summarized as a sequence of evaluative steps that together approximate key functions of a parallel control group through structural and temporal control mechanisms:

Step 1. Risk Profiling of the Intervention

The intervention is characterized with respect to invasiveness, reversibility, and known adverse effects. Only low-risk, non-invasive interventions qualify for control-free exploratory evaluation. [12,13]

Step 2. Baseline Stability Assessment

A sufficiently long and well-documented baseline period is established to confirm temporal stability of the target condition prior to intervention. [10]

Step 3. Within-Subject Longitudinal Observation

Each participant serves as their own control through repeated measurements over time, embedding control within the temporal structure rather than between-group comparison. [3-5]

Step 4. Output-Oriented (Black-Box) Evaluation

The intervention is assessed as a functional system based on reproducible, clinically meaningful outcomes, without requiring early isolation of individual causal components. [6,7]

Step 5. Reproducibility Across Individuals or Contexts

Consistent patterns of change across multiple participants, settings, or implementations are used to strengthen inferential confidence. [14]

Step 6. Safety Monitoring and Escalation Criteria

Continuous monitoring for adverse effects is maintained, and predefined criteria guide progression toward mechanistic studies or controlled trials where warranted. [12,13]

Together, these steps constitute a coherent, proportionate evaluative pathway for early-phase investigation. Methodological control is achieved through temporal structure, reproducibility, and risk-based justification rather than through parallel group allocation.

2.2 Positioning the Framework Among Existing Clinical Research Designs

The methodological framework proposed here does not seek to replace established experimental designs but to occupy a specific and clearly delimited position within the broader landscape of clinical research methodologies. Its primary function is exploratory rather than confirmatory, and its evidentiary claims are intentionally constrained by scope, risk profile, and research objective.

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) remain the preferred design for confirmatory efficacy testing, particularly when interventions carry significant risk, produce irreversible effects, or require precise causal attribution for regulatory or guideline purposes. [1,2] The present framework does not challenge this role and should not be interpreted as an alternative pathway to definitive efficacy claims.

N-of-1 trials similarly rely on within-subject comparison but typically involve randomized or counterbalanced alternation between intervention and control conditions, often with the goal of individual-level treatment optimization. [3,4] In contrast, the proposed framework does not require treatment withdrawal, crossover, or blinding, and is oriented toward identifying reproducible system-level effects across individuals rather than optimizing decisions for a single patient.

Single-case experimental designs (SCEDs) and other time-series methodologies emphasize controlled phase manipulation and formal interruption of exposure. [5] While sharing an emphasis on longitudinal structure, the present framework adopts a more pragmatic stance, prioritizing feasibility and ecological validity over strict phase control when interventions are embedded in real-world clinical systems.

Observational cohort studies typically aim to describe associations or natural histories at the population level. By contrast, the framework proposed here embeds intentional intervention and prospective outcome tracking, while achieving methodological control through temporal structure and baseline stability rather than through group-level comparison.

In summary, this framework occupies an intermediate methodological space: more structured and inferentially constrained than uncontrolled observation, yet more flexible and proportionate than parallel-group experimental designs. It is explicitly designed for early-phase evaluation of complex, low-risk interventions where mechanistic isolation or inert placebo conditions are impractical, premature, or ethically unnecessary. [6,8]

By clearly delineating its intended scope and limitations, the framework supports methodological pluralism while preserving the distinction between exploratory evidence generation and confirmatory causal inference.

2.3 Minimal Analytical Considerations in Control-Free, Within-Subject Designs

The analytical approach appropriate for control-free, within-subject evaluations differs fundamentally from that used in parallel-group confirmatory trials. The primary objective is not precise estimation of population-level effect sizes but the identification of stable, reproducible patterns of change temporally associated with intervention exposure. [15]

Accordingly, emphasis is placed on longitudinal structure rather than cross-sectional comparison. Repeated measurements over time allow assessment of baseline stability, trajectory change, and durability of observed effects. [10] Analyses that model within-subject trends—such as repeated-measures approaches, mixed-effects models, or simple slope comparisons—are generally more informative than single pre–post contrasts.

Visual inspection of individual trajectories, combined with quantitative summaries, plays an important role in distinguishing systematic change from random fluctuation. Consistency of direction, timing, and persistence of change across participants is prioritized over statistical significance testing based on group-level null hypotheses. [15]

The framework explicitly de-emphasizes reliance on isolated p-values derived from single time-point comparisons. Instead, inferential confidence is strengthened through convergence of multiple indicators, including baseline stability, temporal alignment with intervention onset, reproducibility across individuals or settings, and maintenance of effects over time. [14]

Where appropriate, sensitivity analyses may be used to examine the robustness of observed patterns to alternative baseline definitions or analytic assumptions. However, analytical complexity should remain proportionate to study aims and data structure, avoiding overfitting or false precision in exploratory contexts. [15]

These analytical principles are intended to support transparent, proportionate interpretation of exploratory findings rather than to substitute for the rigorous statistical requirements of confirmatory trials.

2.4 Illustrative Application of the Framework (Hypothetical Example)

The following example is intended solely to illustrate the logical application of the proposed framework and does not constitute empirical evidence or a clinical recommendation.

As an illustrative case, consider an intervention situated within an apitherapeutic context, in which the core component is the regular oral consumption of royal jelly. According to publicly available regulatory classifications, royal jelly is generally categorized in most jurisdictions as a food product or dietary supplement rather than as a medicinal product. Its consumption is not associated with known serious adverse effects, and the available evidence suggests a low iatrogenic risk profile.

On this basis, a non-invasive intervention involving royal jelly consumption is consistent with the eligibility criteria articulated in the present framework for control-free, exploratory evaluation. Provided that all additional methodological conditions are met—including the establishment of a sufficiently long and well-documented baseline period, longitudinal within-subject observation, and the predefinition and reproducible measurement of clinically relevant outcomes—a royal jelly–based intervention may, under the present terminology, be examined using a control-free, within-subject evaluative design.

In this context, the primary objective of evaluation is not the early isolation of specific biochemical or pharmacological mechanisms, but rather the assessment of whether the intervention, considered as a functional system within a defined clinical context, produces stable and reproducible changes in relevant outcomes. The favorable safety profile, reversibility, and low risk associated with the intervention justify the application of a pragmatic, output-oriented approach in the initial evaluative phase, while allowing for subsequent progression to more mechanistic or controlled study designs should the findings warrant further investigation.

3. THE PATIENT AS THEIR OWN CONTROL: WITHIN-SUBJECT DESIGNS

In longitudinal clinical research, participants may serve as their own controls through within-subject (pre–post) comparisons. This approach is well established in multiple research domains, including psychology, rehabilitation medicine, and physiology, yet it is often undervalued in debates dominated by parallel-group RCT paradigms. [3,5]

The methodological validity of within-subject control relies on several key conditions. First, the baseline state must demonstrate temporal stability prior to intervention. Second, the observed change must occur in temporal association with the intervention. Third, similar patterns of change must be observed across multiple participants. When these conditions are met, the likelihood that the observed effect is attributable to random fluctuation alone is substantially reduced. [5,10]

Within-subject designs offer several methodological advantages. By controlling for inter-individual variability, they increase sensitivity to change, particularly in heterogeneous populations. They are also ethically advantageous when withholding an intervention is undesirable or impractical. Importantly, the absence of a parallel control group does not imply the absence of control; rather, control is embedded within the temporal structure of the observation. [3]

This approach does not claim to eliminate all sources of bias, nor does it replace randomized designs in confirmatory research. Instead, it provides a legitimate evidentiary framework for early-stage investigation, hypothesis generation, and real-world validation of complex interventions. [6]

4. BLACK-BOX VALIDATION IN COMPLEX SYSTEMS

Complex biological and psychosocial systems are characterized by nonlinearity, feedback loops, and emergent behavior. In such systems, the relationship between input and output cannot always be decomposed into a single dominant causal pathway. [6,7] Attempting full mechanistic isolation at an early investigative stage may therefore obscure, rather than clarify, functional effectiveness. [6]

A black-box approach evaluates an intervention as a functional system, focusing on reproducible outputs rather than complete mechanistic decomposition. This methodology is widely accepted in engineering, systems science, and applied research, where functionality and reliability are often established prior to full explanatory modeling. [7]

In clinical research, black-box validation does not imply disregard for mechanisms. Rather, it reflects a phase-sensitive research strategy in which consistent, clinically meaningful outcomes provide the empirical foundation upon which mechanistic hypotheses can later be built. [6,8] Reproducible effects across settings, populations, or implementations strengthen the inference that the intervention operates as a coherent system, even if the relative contribution of individual components remains uncertain. [6,7]

By prioritizing output-first validation, researchers can identify interventions worthy of further mechanistic and controlled investigation, thereby allocating resources more efficiently and aligning methodology with the nature of the system under study without presupposing which components or pathways are responsible for observed effects. [8]

5. SAFETY AND DEFENSIBILITY AS METHODOLOGICAL FACTORS

Risk is a central determinant of appropriate research methodology. Invasive or high-risk interventions justifiably demand stringent evidentiary thresholds before implementation. [12,13] Conversely, non-invasive interventions with no known serious adverse effects occupy a fundamentally different ethical and methodological space. In such contexts, the primary objectives of early-phase research are often to establish feasibility, observe potential benefit, and confirm safety rather than to deliver definitive causal proof. [12]

When an intervention is characterized by the absence of known side effects, low iatrogenic risk, and reversibility, exploratory study designs without parallel control groups may be methodologically justified, particularly in early-phase research. [13] In such contexts, the primary objectives are to establish feasibility, observe potential benefit, and confirm safety rather than to deliver definitive causal proof.

Safety considerations therefore function not only as ethical constraints but also as methodological enablers. Lower-risk profiles permit greater flexibility in study design, including the use of observational, within-subject, and pragmatic approaches, provided that transparency and proportional interpretation are maintained. [12,13]

This principle of proportionality between risk and evidentiary burden is already embedded in phase-based clinical research frameworks. Early-phase studies are not intended to provide definitive efficacy claims but to generate signals that justify or refute further investigation under more controlled conditions. [12]

Importantly, acknowledging safety as a methodological factor does not imply reduced rigor. Rather, it reflects alignment between the level of methodological control required and the potential consequences of error. In low-risk settings, insisting on maximal methodological constraint at the earliest stages may impede learning without providing commensurate gains in patient protection or scientific validity. [13]

Within the proposed framework, safety monitoring remains mandatory regardless of perceived risk. The absence of adverse effects constitutes a relevant empirical finding and contributes to the overall evidentiary assessment, informing decisions about escalation to mechanistic studies or parallel-group trials where appropriate. [12,13]

6. COMMON CRITICISMS OF CONTROL-FREE DESIGNS AND METHODOLOGICAL RESPONSES

The absence of a parallel control group in exploratory clinical studies frequently invites a set of recurring methodological criticisms. These concerns are legitimate and must be addressed explicitly. However, their presence does not automatically invalidate within-subject or pragmatic designs when such approaches are applied within clearly defined boundaries. [1,2].

6.1 Placebo Effects

One of the most common objections is that observed improvements may be attributable to placebo effects rather than to the intervention itself. Placebo responses are well documented and can influence outcomes across a wide range of clinical contexts, including randomized controlled trials. [11]

Importantly, the presence of placebo effects does not uniquely undermine within-subject designs. Expectancy and contextual influences are not eliminated by randomization alone and may contribute meaningfully to observed outcomes in both controlled and uncontrolled settings. [11]

In complex, multi-component interventions, the distinction between “specific” and “non-specific” effects may be conceptually artificial. Engagement, expectation, and therapeutic context are often integral components of how such interventions function in real-world clinical systems. [6,7]

From a pragmatic perspective, the relevant question is therefore not whether placebo mechanisms contribute, but whether the intervention reliably produces clinically meaningful outcomes without causing harm. Stable baselines and repeated observations further reduce the likelihood that short-lived expectancy effects alone account for sustained or reproducible changes across individuals. [10]

6.2 Natural Course of the Condition

Another common concern is that observed improvements may reflect the natural progression or spontaneous remission of the condition rather than an intervention-associated effect. This possibility must be considered carefully, particularly in conditions characterized by fluctuating or self-limiting trajectories. [10]

Within-subject designs address this concern by emphasizing temporal structure. When a condition demonstrates stability or chronicity prior to intervention, and improvement consistently coincides with intervention onset across multiple cases, the plausibility of spontaneous change as the sole explanation diminishes. [10]

While such temporal association does not establish definitive causality, it supports the presence of a meaningful intervention-related signal that warrants further investigation under more controlled conditions. [8]

6.3 Regression to the Mean

Regression to the mean is a statistical phenomenon that can create the appearance of improvement when participants are selected based on extreme values, a limitation that is especially relevant in studies lacking randomization. [10]

As noted above, regression effects are most pronounced when measurements are taken at a single extreme time point. Longitudinal observation with repeated measurements substantially mitigates this risk by allowing confirmation of baseline stability prior to intervention exposure. [10]

When improvements persist beyond initial post-intervention assessments and are observed consistently across multiple individuals, regression to the mean alone becomes an insufficient explanation for the observed patterns of change. [14]

6.4 Selection Bias and Generalizability

Self-selection and non-random sampling can limit generalizability, a limitation that is openly acknowledged in exploratory and pragmatic study designs. [14]

The primary aim of such studies is not population-level inference but the identification of reproducible patterns,

feasibility, and safety under real-world conditions. In this context, heterogeneous, non-idealized populations may enhance rather than undermine external validity. [8]

Repeated implementation across different settings or populations can function as a form of pragmatic replication, complementing—rather than replacing—later controlled studies designed for definitive causal inference. [6,9]

7. TRANSPARENCY, REPORTING, AND METHODOLOGICAL RIGOR

Exploratory and control-free study designs place particular responsibility on transparent reporting and explicit delineation of methodological boundaries. The flexibility afforded by pragmatic, within-subject approaches does not imply reduced rigor but instead shifts the emphasis toward clarity, reproducibility, and proportional interpretation of findings. [1,2]

Studies conducted within the proposed framework should clearly document the duration and stability of baseline observation, including justification for baseline length and evidence supporting temporal stability prior to intervention exposure. Transparent reporting of baseline characteristics is essential for assessing susceptibility to alternative explanations such as natural disease course or regression to the mean. [10]

Outcome measures, assessment frequency, and criteria for meaningful change should be specified a priori where feasible, even in exploratory contexts. Clear definition of outcomes supports interpretability and reduces the risk of selective reporting or post hoc inference. [1,9]

Longitudinal data presentation is strongly encouraged. Display of individual trajectories alongside summary trends allows independent assessment of temporal patterns, variability, and durability of observed effects and is particularly informative in within-subject designs. [15]

Selective reporting of isolated pre–post contrasts should be avoided. Instead, convergence across multiple indicators—such as baseline stability, temporal alignment with intervention onset, reproducibility across individuals or settings, and maintenance of effects over time—should guide interpretation. [14,15]

Safety monitoring and adverse event reporting are required regardless of perceived intervention risk. The absence of observed adverse effects constitutes a relevant empirical finding and should be explicitly reported rather than assumed. [12,13]

Authors should clearly acknowledge the exploratory nature of findings derived from control-free designs and refrain from definitive causal or efficacy claims. Limitations related to selection bias, generalizability, placebo effects, and alternative explanations should be explicitly addressed. [14]

Where exploratory findings suggest consistent and clinically meaningful benefit, the framework encourages predefinition of escalation criteria guiding progression toward mechanistic studies or parallel-group controlled trials. In this way, control-free evaluation functions not as an endpoint but as a structured entry point into a phased research trajectory. [6,8]

Through explicit reporting standards and proportional interpretation, methodological rigor can be preserved while allowing flexible, real-world evaluation of complex, low-risk clinical interventions. [1,2]

8. SCOPE, LIMITS, AND APPROPRIATE USE OF CONTROL-FREE FRAMEWORKS

Having outlined principles for application, transparency, and rigor, it is essential to define the boundaries within which the proposed framework remains appropriate. Clear articulation of scope and limits is a defining feature of defensible methodology and is particularly important for exploratory and control-free research approaches. [1,2]

The framework proposed here is not intended to replace randomized controlled trials, nor to serve as a universal evaluative strategy. Instead, it occupies a delimited position within a phased research trajectory, aligned with intervention complexity, risk profile, and research objectives. [6,8]

8.1 When Control-Free or Within-Subject Designs Are Appropriate

Control-free or within-subject designs may be methodologically justified when interventions are non-invasive, reversible, and associated with low iatrogenic risk. In such contexts, early-phase research aims are typically exploratory, pragmatic, or hypothesis-generating rather than confirmatory. [12,13]

Additional conditions supporting appropriateness include demonstrable baseline stability of the target condition prior to intervention, intervention complexity that renders component isolation impractical or artificial, and the absence of ethically acceptable inert placebo conditions. [6,7]

When these conditions are met, within-subject control, output-oriented evaluation, and safety-first proportionality together provide a coherent and defensible evidentiary framework for early-stage investigation. [8,12]

8.2 When Parallel Control Groups Are Necessary

Parallel control groups remain essential when interventions carry significant biological or psychological risk, when effects are irreversible, or when small effect sizes require precise causal attribution. In such cases, the potential consequences of error justify higher evidentiary thresholds and stricter methodological constraints. [12,13]

Similarly, regulatory approval, guideline development, or definitive efficacy claims require controlled designs capable of isolating causal effects with high internal validity. Under these circumstances, control-free approaches are insufficient and should be regarded solely as preliminary or hypothesis-generating steps. [1,2]

8.3 From Exploratory Evidence to Controlled Research

Exploratory studies conducted within the proposed framework should be understood as components of a broader research trajectory rather than as endpoints. Their primary functions are to establish safety, feasibility, and reproducible signals of potential benefit under real-world conditions. [8]

Findings generated through control-free evaluation can inform the design of subsequent mechanistic studies or controlled trials, including selection of outcome measures, identification of responsive populations, and determination of appropriate control conditions. [6,9]

By explicitly defining escalation criteria and maintaining proportional interpretation of early findings, the framework supports methodological continuity while preserving the distinction between exploratory evidence generation and confirmatory causal inference. [14]

CONCLUSION

The requirement for a parallel control group has become deeply ingrained in clinical research practice, often functioning as a methodological default rather than a context-sensitive choice. While randomized controlled trials remain indispensable for confirmatory research and for interventions associated with substantial risk, their uncritical application to all forms of clinical inquiry risks conflating rigor with rigidity.

This paper proposes a pragmatic methodological framework for the early-phase evaluation of complex, low-risk clinical interventions in which patients serve as their own controls. By integrating within-subject longitudinal observation, output-oriented black-box validation, and safety-first proportionality, the framework demonstrates that the absence of a parallel control group does not imply the absence of methodological control. Instead, control is achieved through temporal structure, reproducibility of outcomes, and explicit alignment between evidentiary demands and intervention risk.

Crucially, the framework does not reject mechanistic investigation or controlled research. Rather, it articulates a phased research logic in which reproducible, real-world clinical outcomes establish the empirical foundation upon which mechanistic understanding and confirmatory trials can later be built. In this way, exploratory evidence generation is positioned not as an endpoint, but as a structured and ethically proportionate entry point into a broader research trajectory.

By reframing control as a structural and contextual concept rather than a binary requirement, this approach supports methodological pluralism while preserving scientific accountability. It offers a defensible pathway for evaluating interventions that operate within complex human systems, where functionality, safety, and reproducibility may justifiably precede full mechanistic explanation.

REFERENCES

[1] Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D; CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 Statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMJ*. **2010**;340:c332.https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.c332

[2] Friedman LM, Furberg CD, DeMets DL, Reboussin DM, Granger CB. *Fundamentals of Clinical Trials*. 5th ed. New York: Springer; **2015**.

[3] Guyatt G, Sackett D, Taylor DW, Chong J, Roberts R, Pugsley S. Determining optimal therapy—randomized trials in individual patients. *N Engl J Med*. **1986**;314(14):889–892. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM198604033141406

[4] Kravitz RL, Duan N; DEcIDE Methods Center N-of-1 Guidance Panel. *Design and implementation of N-of-1 trials: a user's guide*. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; **2014**.

[5] Kazdin AE. Single-case research designs: methods for clinical and applied settings. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press; **2011**.

[6] Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. **2008**;337:a1655. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a1655

[7] Hawe P, Shiell A, Riley T. Complex interventions: how "out of control" can a randomised controlled trial be? *BMJ*. **2004**;328(7455):1561–1563. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.328.7455.1561

[8] Patsopoulos NA. A pragmatic view on pragmatic trials. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci*. **2011**;13(2):217–224.

[9] Zwarenstein M, Treweek S, Gagnier JJ, et al. Improving the reporting of pragmatic trials: an extension of the CONSORT statement. *BMJ*. **2008**;337:a2390. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a2390

[10] Barnett AG, van der Pols JC, Dobson AJ. Regression to the mean: what it is and how to deal with it. *Int J Epidemiol*. **2005**;34(1):215–220. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyi027

[11] Benedetti F. *Placebo Effects: Understanding the Mechanisms in Health and Disease*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; **2008**.

[12] Emanuel EJ, Wendler D, Grady C. What makes clinical research ethical? *JAMA*. **2000**;283(20):2701–2711. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.283.20.2701

[13] Rid A, Wendler D. Risk-benefit assessment in medical research—critical review and open questions. *Law Probab Risk*. **2011**;10(2):151–177. https://doi.org/10.1093/lpr/mgr006

[14] Ioannidis JPA. Why most discovered true associations are inflated. *Epidemiology*. **2008**;19(5):640–648. https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0b013e31818131e7

[15] Tukey JW. Exploratory Data Analysis. Reading (MA): Addison-Wesley; **1977**.