

# Research ethics reviewing during COVID-19: adaptation, responsiveness, support

Presented by  
**Mokhantso Makoe, PhD**

**28 July 2020**

# Introduction

- Human Sciences Research Council's REC
  - formal ethical review of research with human participants
- National legislative framework
- REC's review framework
- HSRC's REC experience with pandemics
- Uniqueness of the COVID-19 pandemic (rapidly evolving, scientific knowledge limited, uncertainty, direct impact on vulnerability including of potential study participants)

# Characterising the REC environment

- Creativity of researchers from early career to established specialists
- Flexible REC – including the mainstreaming of emergency reviews of COVID-19 studies that require rapid implementation
- Support and understanding on the part of the HSRC senior management
- Overall collegiality and consultations
- Emphasis on learning opportunities

# Introduction

- Human Sciences Research Council's REC
  - formal ethical review of research with human participants
- National legislative framework
- REC's review framework
- HSRC's REC experience with pandemics
- Uniqueness of the COVID-19 pandemic (rapidly evolving, scientific knowledge limited, uncertainty, direct impact on vulnerability including of potential study participants)

# REC's review framework

- In reviewing research protocols, the HSRC REC is guided by **eight requirements for ethical research** (Emanuel et al., 2004)
  - Focused on clinical research in developing countries
  - Adapted for social sciences by Wassenaar, 2006; Wassenaar & Mamotte, 2012)

Based on the 4 key principles in research ethics

- Non-maleficence, Beneficence, Respect for autonomy and Justice: Fair balance of risks and benefits

# Emanuel et al. (2004) 8 requirements for ethical research

- **Principle 1: Collaborative partnership**
  - *Community representatives*
  - *Responsibility sharing*
- **Principle 2: Social value**
  - Research beneficiaries
  - Impact on health systems

- **Principle 3: Scientific validity**

- Appropriate design and methods
- Applicability of results
- Impact on provision of health care services
- Study design feasibility

- **Principle 4: Fair selection**

- Suitable study population
- Risk minimisation
- Benefits to participants
- Vulnerability

## • Principle 5: Informed consent

- Recruitment and incentives applicability to local context
- Appropriate disclosure documents and processes
- Presentation and accuracy of information
- Legally authorised representatives
- Gatekeeper's permission
- Context of consent process



- **Principle 6: Favourable risk-benefit ratio**

- Risk identification and minimisation

- **Principle 7: Independent review**

- Regulatory compliance

- Minimisation and reconciliation of multiple reviews

- **Principle 8: Respect for participants**

- Monitoring health and well-being

- Confidentiality and privacy

- Voluntariness

# Responsiveness to Stakeholders' needs

## Not business as usual for the REC and its clientele

- **Consultative approach** buy-in from HSRC senior management
- Protecting the committee's key stakeholders
  - Researchers and fieldworkers,
- Protecting communities and participants
  - Encouraging researchers to play their part: create awareness, educate, engage with “communities” so they benefit from participating in research

# COVID-19 related studies

- The need for rapid studies – evidence base for policy responses
- **Designs:** social surveys, epidemiological studies, qualitative designs
- **Data collection methods:** online/digital, social media, photovoice, focus group discussion
- **Populations/samples/units of analysis:** Adults, youth (KAB), children, employees (impact, w.f.h)/ households, individuals

# Proactive measures to facilitate reviews

- How were different studies affected?

**In-the-field studies**

**Provisionally approved studies**

**New studies**

- REC's approach to protecting lives – guided by the **national response** and the calibration of risk levels from 5 to 1.
- **New standard operating procedures**
  - 10<sup>th</sup> March meeting – REC/MGNT

# COVID-19 related studies

- The need for rapid studies – evidence base for policy responses
- **Designs:** social surveys, epidemiological studies, qualitative designs
- **Data collection methods:** online/digital, telephonic, social media, photovoice, focus group discussion
- **Populations/samples/units of analysis:** Adults, youth (KAB), children, employees (impact, w.f.h)/ households, individuals

# COVID-19 specific ethics review issues

- **Need to reorganise the committee's business**
- **Expedited reviews** – in between meeting reviews by sub-committee members
- Study protocols: COVID-19-related research and non-COVID related topics
- **Commonalities and differences**
- Overall need to adapt methodologies to the new safety requirements, harm minimisation
- Protocol amendments...

# Critical assessment of some of data collection methods that researchers propose

- Feasibility? E.g. Focus group discussions – social distancing? (safety)?
- Legality? – E.g. Photovoice during Level 5 lockdown
- Science and ethics? – uncertainty with testing procedures and science **not immediately** benefiting study participants
- The tacit sense that one's study is important – less careful risk-benefit ratio assessment
- Reimbursements online data collection – **data costs**

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Prof Theresa Rossouw, REC Chairperson

Ms Khutso Sithole, REC Administrator

Thank you