

Find document-quality issues earlier. Review faster. Keep humans in control.

TrialVerity helps regulated Quality, Engineering and Regulatory teams reduce repetitive review effort, surface meaningful issues earlier, support controlled corrections and preserve review evidence.

AI finds and proposes. Humans decide. TrialVerity records what happened.

Why TrialVerity

Regulated and quality-sensitive documents often pass through repeated cycles of authoring, peer review, quality review, traceability checking, correction and audit preparation. Small defects become more expensive when they are discovered late - unresolved placeholders, inconsistent values, missing requirement links, subjective acceptance criteria, or document-to-document conflicts.

TrialVerity is designed to shift more of that discovery earlier. It applies governed, document-type-specific Review Standards, produces evidence-backed findings and proposed corrections, and keeps qualified reviewers in control of every final decision.

Reduce review effort Automate repetitive first-pass checks so experts can focus on judgment.	Catch issues earlier Surface missing criteria, contradictions, placeholders and traceability gaps.	Reduce rework Address quality issues closer to document creation.
Accelerate finalization Connect findings, human decisions, corrections and Word redlines.	Protect integrity Withhold unsafe placement rather than guessing where to change text.	Preserve evidence Keep versions, Review Standards, findings and decisions connected.

The operating model



The objective is not to replace reviewers. It is to make every hour of expert review more productive.

Human authority	TrialVerity does not autonomously approve or finalize controlled documents. Reviewers inspect evidence and can Accept, Reject or Modify recommendations.
------------------------	--

How TrialVerity helps

TrialVerity combines AI-assisted review with explicit governance and controlled correction - designed to be faster than purely manual first-pass review without turning document approval over to AI.

Governed Review Standards Quality teams define and version what TrialVerity should check for each document type.	Evidence-backed findings Findings are tied back to source evidence rather than unsupported conclusions.
Cross-document consistency Linked documents can be evaluated together for configured traceability and consistency problems.	Controlled corrections AI can propose corrections, but unsafe placement is withheld and missing engineering facts are not invented.
Native Word workflow Safely placeable corrections can be represented using native Word tracked changes.	Audit & history Run, configuration and human-decision history can be retained for reconstruction.

Examples of issues TrialVerity is designed to surface

Missing or weak acceptance criteria	Unresolved TBDs / placeholders	Broken or missing traceability
Inconsistent terminology or values	Ambiguous pass/fail language	Cross-document conflicts

Safety boundary	TrialVerity separates finding a problem from changing a document. It can flag a missing requirement reference without fabricating an identifier; if an edit cannot be located safely, it remains unplaced.
------------------------	--

Where the platform can fit

TrialVerity uses a common governed review engine that can be configured for multiple controlled-document families rather than requiring a separate application for every document type.

Document family	Representative examples
Requirements & Design	PRD, Design Specification, SRS, Trace Matrix
Verification & Validation	DVP, DVR, Software V&V; reports
Manufacturing / Qualification	Validation plans/reports, IQ, OQ, PQ
Clinical / Regulatory	Clinical plans/reports, CER, regulatory documents
Post-Market / Quality	PMS, PSUR and related quality documentation

Measure the value in a controlled pilot

The strongest business case is measured with the customer's own baseline. A focused pilot can start with 2-3 customer-approved, non-sensitive document types.

Measure	What to learn
First-pass review time	Whether repetitive review effort decreases
Defect detection / false positives	Whether meaningful issues are found with acceptable reviewer noise
Reviewer disposition time	How efficiently reviewers can Accept, Reject or Modify findings
Redline usability	How useful safely placeable corrections are in Word
Rework / comment cycles	Whether earlier discovery reduces downstream iteration
Audit-evidence effort	Whether preserved history reduces reconstruction work

Start with the bottleneck: Which part of the current document-review process consumes the most time - initial review, traceability checking, resolving reviewer comments, cross-document consistency, or preparing the audit trail?

Scope: TrialVerity is assistive. Exact deployment, validation, regulatory/privacy obligations, sensitive processing, retention, integrations and Review Standards depend on intended use. Savings should be established through pilot measurement.