

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/). Your use of this material constitutes acceptance of that license and the conditions of use of materials on this site.



Copyright 2009, The Johns Hopkins University and Nancy Kass. All rights reserved. Use of these materials permitted only in accordance with license rights granted. Materials provided "AS IS"; no representations or warranties provided. User assumes all responsibility for use, and all liability related thereto, and must independently review all materials for accuracy and efficacy. May contain materials owned by others. User is responsible for obtaining permissions for use from third parties as needed.



JOHNS HOPKINS
BLOOMBERG
SCHOOL *of* PUBLIC HEALTH

Section D: Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)

Nancy E. Kass, ScD

Background: U.S. IRBs

- 1974-1978: National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects in Behavioral and Biomedical Research
- Produced *Belmont Report*, which defined principles for ethical research

U.S. Regulations

- Overseen by Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), DHHS
- Institution agrees it will review all federally funded human research (or all human research, depending on how “assurance” is written)
- “Federalwide Assurance” (FWA) from OHRP “assuring” that institution is in compliance with law

U.S. Regulations

- Review locally at institution—not at U.S. government level
- Independent committee
 - At “awardee’s” institution
 - At “performance site”

Committee Composition

- At least five members, varying backgrounds
- At least one non-scientist
- At least one member from outside of institution
- Gender balance

Administrative Requirements

- Keep records of all communication
- Keep minutes
- Review at least once per year

Review Requirements

- Risks are minimized to extent possible
- Risks are reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits
- Selection of subjects is equitable and justified
- Consent elements, documentation
- Procedures for data monitoring
- Confidentiality protected

Expedited Review vs. Full Committee

- According to U.S. rules, certain types of research may be reviewed by only one committee member
 - Lower-risk research
 - Low-risk changes to existing research
- IRB itself must determine which category of research is being conducted

Challenges with IRB/REC Process

- Only able to review what is submitted, not what occurs in the field
- Not all committees make the same decisions about the same protocols
 - Is this a problem or not?

Challenges with IRB/REC Process

- Only able to review what is submitted, not what occurs in the field
- Not all committees make the same decisions about the same protocols
 - Is this a problem or not?
- Some committees have inadequate training
 - Then tend to focus more on science or budget or just consent form
- Some committees have inadequate funding
 - Unable to copy or review in advance
 - Unable to meet in person very often

Multi-site Research

- Different models
 - Many sites within one country
 - Different sites in different countries
- Issues in multi-site review
 - Generally must be reviewed at every site
 - Not all committees decide the same way
 - Time consuming
 - What to do if reviews conflict?

Multi-site Research

- Different models
 - Many sites within one country
 - Different sites in different countries
- Issues in multi-site review
 - Generally must be reviewed at every site
 - Not all committees decide the same way
 - Time consuming
 - What to do if reviews conflict?
- Centralized model being tried as “pilot” approach