Resources to Aid Ethical Review of Clinical Studies: Gaps and Opportunities

Merle-Marie Pittelkow[1*] (0000-0002-7487-7898), Daniel Strech[1] (0000-0002-9153-079X)

[1] QUEST Center for Responsible Research, Berlin Institute of Health at Charité, Berlin, Germany

*Correspondence to: merle-marie.pittelkow@bih-charite.de, Anna-Louisa-Karsch Straße 2, 10178 Berlin, Germany

Abstract

Background: Research Ethics Committees (RECs) review the ethical, legal, and methodological standard of clinical research. However, complying with all requirements and professional expectations while maintaining the necessary scientific and ethical standards can be challenging for applicants and members of the REC alike. There is a need for easily accessible and clear guidelines and resources to help medical researchers and REC members navigate the legal and ethical requirements and the process of their review.

Methods: We employed an explorative search for resources on the websites of relevant stakeholders including 12 national umbrella associations (six German-language and six English-language), three English-language international umbrella associations, and 16 national REC's of major university hospitals (eight German- and eight English-language). We mapped the identified resources onto the guiding principles of ethical clinical research and 35 related checkpoints. To describe the content of the resources we conducted a thematic analysis.

Results: We extracted a total of 233 resources, including templates (*n* = 134, 58.5%), guidelines/recommendations (*n* = 62, 26.6%), checklists (*n* = 23, 9.9%), tools (*n* = 5, 2.2%), flowcharts (*n* = 5, 2.2%), glossaries (*n* = 3, 1.3%), and one (0.4%) software program. We extracted 101 German and 132 English resources created between 2004 and 2023. The majority (*n* = 204; 87.6%) could be assigned to one checkpoint. The remaining 29 (12.5%) resources were considered unspecific (e.g., a checklist which documents to be submitted for a German drug trial). The specific resources are discussed per checkpoint.

Conclusion: While much support is available for some aspects such as participant information and informed consent forms, it is lacking in other areas such as study design, analysis, and biometrics. More support should be provided in these areas to ensure that research projects are methodologically sound. A more detailed analysis of the quality of available resources could help identify other areas of need.

Background

Human clinical research plays a central role in the development and validation of therapies (including drugs, biologics, medical devices) and diagnostics (McNair, 2022). To ensure that clinical trials involving human participants meet the highest standards of research ethics, they must be reviewed by an institutional review board (IRB) or research ethics committees (RECs)[1]. RECs evaluate clinical trials for ethical justification, including the risks and benefits to study participants, the informed consent documents, scientific soundness, and methodological soundness including aspects of the study design and statistical analysis. Consequently, RECs are of vital importance for the ethical, legal, and methodological standard of clinical research.

Applicants must navigate a complex landscape of ethical, legal, and methodological requirements. Members of RECs on the other hand must handle these aspects in a responsible and fair manner. Some aspects are governed by international law, others by federal or state law, and some refer to non-legal professional laws and guidelines such as the Declaration of Helsinki (World Medical Association, 2013) or CIOMS guidelines (Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences, 2016). Furthermore, ethical judgements on the appropriateness of consent documents or risk-benefit ratios require expert knowledge and, unavoidably, include interpretive judgments.

Complying with all legal requirements and further professional expectations while maintaining the necessary scientific and ethical standards can be challenging for applicants and members of the REC alike. Consequently, there is a need for easily accessible and clear guidelines and resources to help medical researchers and REC members navigate the legal and ethical requirements and the process of their review. Several types of resources could facilitate the application and review process, including checklists, templates, topic-specific guidelines, decision trees or online tools. Note that we have intentionally excluded textbooks and published papers from

[1] The term IRB is more commonly used in America. In this article, we will use the term REC, which is more common in Europe.

this list, as they are not as readily accessible and require a greater time commitment that is rarely achievable in application and review procedures for individual clinical studies.

Many umbrella organizations and RECs already offer online resources for applicants and REC members. For example, the German association of RECs (Arbeitskreis Medizinischer Ethik-Kommissionen, AKEK) or the World Health Organization (WHO) offer guidelines and templates online to aid the application process (Arbeitskreis Medizinischer Ethikkommissionen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland e.V., 2023; World Health Organization, 2023). However, these individual resources are spread across many websites, making it opaque what the existing resources offer. A scoping review in Pubmed and Google on "Resources to Aid Ethical Review of Clinical Studies" did not reveal a systematically developed overview of available resources. It is therefore unclear to what extent the available resources cover aspects of clinical research ethics.

The objective of this project is to explore and qualitatively describe the pool of available resources. Our search is not intended to identify all available resources, but to give a qualitative overview of what types of resources are commonly available. Therefore, we employed an explorative search for resources on the websites of relevant stakeholders including umbrella associations of RECs and RECs of major university hospitals and limited ourselves to German- and English-language resources.

Methods

Protocol and Registration

As this was a dynamic, data-driven project, we did not preregister this project. In the interest of transparency, we provide a project log and all relevant material on OSF (https://osf.io/e7dmt/).

Search and Selection of Sources

We searched for online resources provided by national and international umbrella organisations for clinical research ethics as well as RECs of large university hospitals in Germany, the United States, and the United Kingdom (see Table 1). The project started in February 2023 with creating a list of potential sources and stakeholders from personal experience and expertise of the

authors. We then searched the websites of relevant umbrella associations. We also applied backward searching, meaning that we examined relevant stakeholders when they were mentioned on the websites of the umbrella associations. We added them to the search if we could identify additional resources from them. Next, we looked for additional resources by searching the websites of the RECs of major university hospitals. To identify all potential resources on each individual website, we first opened all subtabs linked to from the starting website. We then went through each subpage one after the other and searched for resources relating to ethics.

The search was stopped in August 2023 when we reached saturation defined as encountering the same kind of resources (e.g., templates for informed consent) without being able to add untapped resources to the collection.

Information Sources

We identified 31 information sources listed in Table 1. This included 12 national umbrella associations (six German-language and six English-language), three English-language international umbrella associations, and 16 national REC's (eight German- and eight English-language).

Eligibility Criteria

We limited ourselves to German- and English-language resources but employed liberal eligibility criteria. To be extracted, resources had to relate to the application for ethical approval for clinical studies. Clinical studies could be mono- or multi-site studies, trials testing medical products, drugs, or other medical interventions with human participants. Resources could be several types like checklists, templates, flowcharts, or recommendations and be addressed to either the applicants (i.e., applied researchers) or REC members or both. We did not extract resources in the form of legal texts, tutorials for university-specific submission programs, or course syllabi. To avoid duplication, we did not extract resources if they were already extracted from a previous source. Note that this limits the comparability of the number of resources between sources as we did not count the number of all resources available but the number of resources, not yet presented at previously extracted sources.

Data Items

For each resource, we assigned a number (e.g., R1) and extracted: the stakeholder and their main website, the country, the year of publication, the type of study if applicable, the type of resource, the link to the resource, a description of the resource, the language the resource was published in, and comments if applicable. The extraction sheet was piloted with a selection of resources from the first stakeholder considered (i.e., AKEK) and adjusted accordingly.

Data Charting Process

To qualitatively describe the resources, we mapped them onto the guiding ethical principles of an internationally established framework for clinical research, namely, social value, scientific validity, favorable risk-benefit ratio, fair participant selection, independent review, informed consent, respect for participants, and collaborative partnership (see Emanuel et al., 2008) and 35 related checkpoints presented in Raspe et al. (2012). The 35 checkpoints presented in Figure 1 provide a more detailed and praxis-oriented account of how the guiding principles are translated into the ethical review process.

The assignment of resources to checkpoints was done in two steps. If possible, resources were assigned to one of the 35 checkpoints during extraction. If no clear assignment was possible, the resource was grouped under 'other'. During data analysis, we checked whether this assignment was congruent with the content of the resource. This resulted in 21 resources being relabeled (for details please see the project log provided on OSF).

To describe the available resources, the first author (MMP) conducted a thematic analysis in Atlas.ti. For our project, we used thematic analysis as a realist method, reporting the themes covered by the available resources. Themes were identified at the semantic level from the content explicitly mentioned in the resources. We used a deductive approach by having the checkpoints guide our qualitative analysis and theme construction. First, we grouped documents according to the checkpoints assigned during data extraction. Next, we started coding the resources for the first ten checkpoints to create a codebook, for which the overall structure was continuously revised during

the process. Following, we restarted coding with the revised codebook structure (i.e., authors, target group, resource type, main topic, topic, language, study type, participant type, data type, and legal regulations) and coded all resources. While additional subcodes were added during this stage, the overall theme structure remained

Results

We initially extracted 243 resources from the websites of 24 stakeholders[2] (see Table 1) reflecting umbrella associations of RECs and RECs of major university hospitals. During data analysis, we excluded ten resources (nine due to eligibility criteria and one duplicate). This resulted in a total of 233 resources. The majority (*n* = 204; 87.6%) could be assigned to one checkpoint. The remaining 29 (12.5%) resources were considered unspecific (e.g., a checklist which documents to be submitted for a German drug trial).

Resources included templates (*n* = 134, 58.5%), guidelines/recommendations (*n* = 62, 26.6%), checklists (*n* = 23, 9.9%), tools (*n* = 5, 2.2%), flowcharts (*n* = 5, 2.2%), glossaries (*n* = 3, 1.3%), and one (0.4%) software program. We extracted 101 German resources and 132 English resources. Resources were created between 2004 and 2023 with more resources being created or updated recently (see Figure 2.)

Qualitative Description of Resources

Below, we provide a brief overview of the available resources per checkpoint. A more detailed overview of the available resources per checkpoint and the themes they cover is presented in Table 2 and the full list of all available resources can be found in the supplement (https://osf.io/5xeqm). Following the structure proposed by Raspe and colleagues (2012) we grouped checkpoints and resources under the headings of (1) study governance/management [*n* = 24, 10.30%], (2) research question and study design [*n* = 32, 13.73%], (3) study participants [*n* = 99, 40.77%], and (4) documentation, analysis, and dissemination [*n* = 49, 21.03%] (see Figure 1). The remaining 29 (12.45%) resources were grouped under 'other'.

[2] For seven stakeholders, we did not find any additional resources to extract.

Study Governance/Management.

The topic "Study Governance/Management" covers the broad set of activities of principal investigators (PIs), sponsors or other staff involved in managing and governing a specific clinical study. Our search revealed supporting resources for most but not all the checkpoints grouped under this topic (5/8; 62.50%).

Support was offered regarding the qualifications of study management, investigators, and study sites (*n* = 14), the implementation of multi-site studies (n = 5) with a specific focus on ancillary review, the collaboration between study management and sponsors (n = 2)[3], the transparent calculation and tracking of study financing (n = 2), and the reporting of conflict of interests (n = 1).

Our search revealed no resources to support the creation of an appropriate study title, study registration, and notification of authorities, the identification of relevant legal regulations, or the composition or creation of study committees.

Research Question and Study Design.

The topic "Research Question and Study Design" covers conceptual and methodological aspects of the study development and design. Our search revealed resources to support only the minority (4/11; 36.36%) of the checkpoints grouped under this topic.

Support was offered for the design and organization of study protocols (n = 23) including resources offering universal support or targeting specific study designs or data collection methods, the selection and specifically the recruitment of participants (n = 7), the risk assessment of an intervention in a clinical study involving therapies of medicinal products, and the reporting of trial termination to the responsible REC (n = 1).

Our search revealed no resources to support the other checkpoints relating to study design. Namely, the research question, background, objective, hypothesis, and target population, the

[3] Our search suggests that some RECs such as for example the University Hospital Bristol and University Hospital Birmingham offer institution specific resources regarding sponsorship. These did not meet our inclusion criteria but are presented in the data file on OSF under 'other resources'.

summary of the current state of knowledge, sample size calculation, the study type and study design, the control group/intervention, blinding, and the study outcomes.

Study Participants

The topic "Study Participants" covers aspects related to the safety and compensation of study participants. Our search revealed resources to support the majority (6/7; 85.71%) of the checkpoints grouped under this topic.

Specifically, support was offered for the preparation of participant information and informed consent forms (n = 74) including resources offering universal support or targeting specific study designs, participant types, or situations, the inclusion and treatment of members of vulnerable groups (n = 8), aspects related to insurance (n= 6), the development of informed consent strategies for participants that are incapable of providing consent (n = 5), the collection and storage of biological or genetic material (n = 3)[4], and the financial compensation for participation (n = 1)[5].

Our search did not yield results for resources to support setting up medical care or psychosocial support for study participants.

Documentation, Analysis, Reporting

The topic "Documentation, Analysis, Reporting" covers aspects relating the documentation, storage, and sharing or data, methods, and results. Our search revealed resources to support the majority (7/8; 87.50%) of the checkpoints grouped under this checkpoint.

Specifically, support was offered for the documentation and reporting of adverse events and side effects (n = 14), the collection (n = 5) protection (n = 10), and preservation of data (n = 9), documentation purposes (n = 9), and the analysis (n = 1) and reporting (n = 1) of study results. Our search did not reveal any resources to control study implementation.

---

[4] Please note that the collection of biological materials was addressed in 13 additional resources including informed consent templates, insurance templates, and templates for participant information, which are grouped under different checkpoints.

[5] However, financial arrangements and compensation was also mentioned in two additional resources. Guideline R134 grouped under participant recruiting explores the option of financial compensation and template R217 grouped under study financing has a section for financial arrangements.

Other

We extracted an additional 29 resources ($n_{English}$ = 18, n_{German} = 11) that could not be grouped under one of the checkpoints. This included 12 checklists, nine guidelines, five templates, two tools, and one flowchart. The checklists concerned the required documents to be submitted for several types of studies, evaluation of the application or study protocol, continuing review, human research determination, project closure and the use of templates (from swissethics). Guidelines targeted the evaluation of applications, the obligation to report changes to the study protocol to the REC, human research determination, guidance how to apply through the online portal ethikPool or a compilation of international human research standards. The tools offered online training for clinical research ethics and the flowchart could be used to find answers to ethical questions that might arise during the research process.

Discussion

Resource Landscape

At the websites of umbrella associations of RECs and RECs of major university hospitals we found a broad spectrum of resources supporting clinical researchers and members of RECs with setting up a clinical study, applying for ethical approval, and reviewing applications. The majority of these resources were templates, followed by guidelines and checklists.

For some checkpoints, numerous and varied resources are available. For example, we extracted a great number of resources to support the preparation and assessment of participant information and informed consent documents including templates, guidelines, checklists, online tools, and glossaries. These resources cover many different participant groups, subject areas (e.g., language, surrogate decision makers, etc.), and legal contexts. Likewise, we found a variety of resources for the preparation of study protocols for various study types, the assessment of qualifications of investigators and study sites, the reporting and documentation of adverse events, and data protection.

Gaps

Still, support for ethical aspects in clinical research varies between different checkpoints. While various types of support are available for some aspects such as participant information and informed consent forms, it is lacking in other areas such as study design, analysis, and biometrics.

In some instances, there are reasonable explanations for a lack of resources provided by the stakeholders under investigation. For example, umbrella associations and RECs provided limited resources to aid applicants in completing trial registrations. Instead, they offered links referring to the websites of trial registries. Although this leads to a dispersion of information, it is reasonable to assume that the registries themselves are responsible for providing resources for trial registration. Indeed, the DRKS [Deutsches Register Klinischer Studien] or clinicaltrials.gov websites – which were not included in the current review - offer several resources and explanations of points to consider when registering for a clinical study (Bundesinstitute für Arzneimittel und Medizinprodukte, 2023; National Library of Medicine, 2023). Yet, there is a risk that the dispersed information may make it too time-consuming for applicants to find the support they need, which could negatively impact the quality of registrations and explain shortcomings (as reported by Thiele & Hirschfeld, 2022; Viergever et al., 2014).

Likewise, while many clinical study types such as drug trials and investigations of medicinal products are governed by legal regulations, we did not find resources to support researchers in navigating said documents. Instead of offering resources, stakeholders refer directly to the legal texts. Assuming that the legal requirements for clinical trials are reflected in the various checkpoints (e.g., qualification of the principal investigator), it is understandable that there were no resources that could be specifically allocated to this point. Nonetheless, we believe that researchers could benefit from interpretive aids or checklists of the requirements arising from the legal regulatory framework.

On other aspects, this review identifies important gaps in the existing resources. Specifically, we found no or only very few resources for aspects related to study design and biometrics. This might be explained by the implicit assumption that this expertise resides not in ethics but in the

medical profession itself. In contrast to other topics, however, we did not find websites referencing existing structures such as clinical study coordination systems or methodological and/or statistical consultation for clinical trials offered by university hospitals. It is therefore the researcher's responsibility to find out about these services. Links to external resources provided at the REC websites might be helpful here as well. In addition, the psychological hurdle of a personal consultation can be high, as it requires preparation on the part of the researcher. It therefore remains questionable to what extent these offers are taken up in the stressful everyday life of researchers. There is still a need for simple, understandable, and easy-to-use resources on the topic of study design and biometrics for clinical research in humans, as for example available for animal research (e.g., the Experimental Design Assistant created by Du Sert et al., 2017).

Even if we were able to assign resources to a given checkpoint, it remains open whether these indeed cover all themes within a given topic area. For example, participant selection does not only concern the recruitment but also the appropriate selection of participants. This includes judgements regarding the representativeness of the participant pool of the population under study, and appropriate in- and exclusion criteria. However, we did not find resources addressing these aspects of the participant selection. Similarly, we did not find many resources supporting the reporting of conflict of interest (CoI), even though other stakeholders such as journals and publishers developed tools to support CoI statement creation (e.g., https://declarations.elsevier.com/).

Opportunities

This project points to opportunities to further develop and refine resources to support and improve the research ethics application process in clinical research. The main output of the project is an overview of resources created and made available by important stakeholders. This overview can be used (1) as a starting point for further tool and resource development and (2) as a database for future research evaluating the quality of tools and resources and how they map onto the needs of applicants and REC members. For example, future research might create new tools and resources to address the gaps identified here. Additionally, it would be valuable to determine whether the

resources that are already offered by the stakeholders included in this review address the needs of applicants and REC members sufficiently.

Eventually, we believe, resources can help and improve the quality of the ethical review process for everyone including applicants, REC members, and research participants. At present, there are no established measures to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of RECs (Anderson et al., 2023). This is likely because the process of research ethics applications and approvals are based on ethical and regulatory standards that are subjectively applied (Lynch et al., 2022). In the absence of effectiveness measures, tools, templates, checklists, and other resources can improve the procedure of clinical ethical review by setting a systematic, transparent, and comparable standard. At the very least, the systematic use of resources and tools makes the review process more efficient and ensures compliance with regulatory and institutional policies, two quality indicators often mentioned by directors of RECs (add Lynch et al., 2022). At best, the use of tools and resources for REC applications and decision-making procedures would enable thoughtful engagement with the procedure of REC decision making and promote consistent and robust standards (see for example Seykora et al., 2021).

Limitations

Although this review has covered many prominent and relevant stakeholders, we recognize that our results likely do not cover all resources available to clinical researchers and REC members. Some information may be located on websites of stakeholders that we did not consider, while other information may be shared internally and not publicly available. For example, within our search, we encountered password-protected pages to which we did not have access. This means that additional resources might be available, but not accessible.

We also caution that our collection of resources should not be taken as a recommendation. In our qualitative analysis, we noticed markable variation in the depth and quality of different resources. However, this analysis was by no means synonymous with a detailed analysis of the accuracy and timeliness of the resources. At present, it is still unclear to what extent the available

resources are qualitatively valuable. Further in-depth textual analysis of the individual resources and user-testing is needed, but beyond the scope of this paper.

Lastly, we did not differentiate between supporting templates and forms which are required to be completed by the REC or (national) law. While we label forms as such in the amendment, we did not treat them as a separate category in the analysis as forms can be considered supportive by making the research ethic application process more transparent and systematic and therefore easier to understand and follow. However, others might wish to make this distinction in follow-up research.

Conclusion

This project provided an initial overview of the resources available to support applicants and REC members. We hope that this project will stimulate greater engagement with available resources and the identified thematic gaps, both in consultation with relevant stakeholder groups.

Acknowledgements: We thank Ulrike Grittner, Sebastian Graf von Kielmansegg, Lucas Augustin, Eva Winkler, and Annette Rid for their input and feedback at several stages of the project.

Funding: This work was conducted as part of the GUIDEME project funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF 01GP2208A). DS received the funding. The funder had no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Data Availability Statement: All data produced are available online at https://osf.io/e7dmt/.

Tables and Figures



Figure 1. *The 35 Checkpoints associated with the guiding principles of ethical clinical research.*



Figure 2. *Development of resources over time. Note that for 45 resources we were unable to extract a year of creation.*

Table 1. Overview of the informational sources

Language	Name	Identified via	Nr. Resources
National umbrella associations			
German	Arbeitskreis Medizinischer Ethik-Kommissionen (AKEK)	Author team	32
German	Swiss Human Research Ethics Committee (Swissethics)	Author team	45
German	Forum Österreicher Ethikkommissionen	Author team	1
German	Technologie- und Methodenplattform für die vernetzte medizinische Forschung e.V.	AKEK	1
German	Bundesinstitute für Arzneimittel und Medizinprodukte	Ethik-Kommission Westfalen-Lippe	1
German	Paul Ehrlich Institute	Ethik-Kommission Westfalen-Lippe	3
English	National Health Service (NHS) Health Research Authority	Author team	10
English	United Kingdom Research and Innovation (UKRI)	Author team, online search	4
English	Canadian Institutes of Health Research	Online search	1
English	SmartIRB	Online search	1
English	National Institute of Health (NIH)	Author team	0
English	Clinical Research Ethics Consultation Collaborative	Online search	1
International Umbrella Associations			
English	World Health Organization (WHO)	Author team	13
English	European Network of Research Ethics Committees (EUREC)	Online search	1
English	Ethics and New Emerging Research Institutions (ENERI)	Online search	1
National RECs			
German	Ethik-Kommission Westfalen-Lippe	Author team	4
German	Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich (LMU)	Author team	12
German	Hannover Medical School (MHH)	Author team	4
German	Ärztekammer Hamburg	Author team	0
German	University of Cologne	Author team	7
German	Heidelberg University	Author team	5
German	Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg	Author team	4
German	University of Vienna	Author team	0
English	Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics	Author team	31
English	Mayo Clinic	Author team	0
English	Johns Hopkins	Author team	21
English	University Hospital Bristol	Author team	23
English	Royal Stoke	Author team	0
English	Cambridge	Author team	0
English	Oxford	Author team	0
English	University Hospitals Birmingham	Author team	9

Table 2. Extracted resources per checkpoint.

Checkpoint	N	Available Resources
Study Governance/Management	24	
1. Identification, study registration, and reporting	0	None
2. Study leadership/ investigators, study/examination centres	14	- 6 guidelines (examiner qualification, required qualifications) - 6 templates (site suitability, examiner suitability, and investigator CV) - 2 flowcharts (examiner suitability)
3. Sponsor	2	- 2 templates (amendments to be evaluated by sponsor, clinical study agreement)
4. Study financing	2	- 1 tool (transparent cost calculation) - 1 template (transparent cost calculation)
5. Study implementation	5	1 checklist (ancillary review, multi-site studies) 3 guidelines (ancillary review) 1 template (ancillary review, multi-site studies)
6. Conflict of interest	1	- 1 template (financial disclosure)
7. Study committees	0	None
8. Legal regulations	0	None
Research Question, Study Design	32	
9. Question, background, objective, hypotheses, target population	0	None
10. Summary of the current state of knowledge	0	None
11. Participant selection	7	- 3 guidelines (participant recruitment, appropriate language) - 3 templates (recruitment ads, telephone recruitment script) - 1 checklist (recruitment via advertisement)
12. Sample size determination	0	none
13. Study type/ study design	0	none
14. Study protocol/examination plan with timetable, work plan	23	- 15 templates (study protocols for general clinical studies, prospective studies, retrospective studies, qualitative studies, studies with medical devices, studies with in vitro diagnostics, dead body(parts), and humans) - 5 guidelines (study protocols for clinical studies in general, prospective studies, retrospective studies, and qualitative studies) - 3 checklists (general aspects, one with patient reported outcomes)
15. Intervention	1	- 1 template (risk assessment)
16. Control group/ control intervention	0	none
17. Blinding	0	none
18. Study outcomes	0	none
19. Early termination	1	- 1 template (termination of the study including early termination)
Study Participants	99	-
20. Participant information and informed consent	76	- 51 templates (informed consent forms and study information for various types of research [minimal risk, magnetic resonance imaging, trials with medicinal products, drug trials, trials with biological or genetic materials, trials with radiation], types of participants [consenting adults, children, parents and legal guardians, pregnant people], and situations [expanded access, new information, continued participation, screening, ancillary review]; verbal consent; general consent This also included one template for general consent)

Continued

Table 2. continued

Checkpoint	N	Available Resources
20. Participant information and informed consent (continued)		- 14 guidelines (requirements participant information and informed consent forms, electronic consent, non-native speaker, appropriate language, research with children) - 6 checklists (informed consent) - 3 glossaries (laypeople language) - 2 tools (participant information, informed consent)
21. Inability to consent	5	- 3 guidelines (surrogate decision makers, post-mortem studies) - 2 templates (informed consent forms for surrogate decision makers)
22. Other vulnerable groups of study participants	8	- 5 guidelines (research with minors, language for people with learning disability, emergency research) - 2 templates (pregnancy report forms) - 1 checklist (research with minors)
23. Insurance	6	- 3 guidelines (participant insurance, general requirements) - 3 templates (liability insurance, confirmation of insurance)
24. Financial arrangements	1	- 1 guideline (compensation)
25. Medical care/psychosocial support	0	
26. Body (bio)materials, genetic examination/analysis	3	- 2 guidelines (evaluation of biobanks) - 1 template (data repository genetic data)
Documentation, Analysis, Reporting	49	-
27. Data protection	10	- 3 guidelines (GDPR, biobanks) - 6 templates (GDPR, data leaks, participant information, biological material) - 1 software (anonymization)
28. Data collection	5	- 4 templates (data management plan, data collection form) - 1 guideline (review data management plan)
29. Data preservation	9	- 6 templates (data sharing, archiving) - 3 guidelines (data sharing, retention period, databases and required approvals)
30. Control of study implementation	0	
31. Documentation	9	- 8 templates (handover plan, amendment log, training log, site screening log, adverse event log) - 1 guideline (essential research documentation)
32. Adverse events, side effects	14	- 12 templates (reporting, follow up) - 2 guidelines (health related findings, safety update report)
33. Analysis	1	- 1 flowchart (biometry)
34. Scientific publications, communication of results	1	- 1 template (publication and conference presentations)
35. Ethical justifiability	0	
Other	29	

References

Anderson, E. E., Johnson, A., & Lynch, H. F. (2023). Inclusive, engaged, and accountable institutional review boards. *Accountability in Research*, *0*(0), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2220884

Arbeitskreis Medizinischer Ethikkommissionen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland e.V. (2023). *AKEK - Arbeitskreis Medizinischer Ethik-Kommissionen*. https://www.akek.de

Bundesinstitute für Arzneimittel und Medizinprodukte. (2023). *Deutsches Register Klinischer Studien*. Deutsches Register Klinischer Studien. https://www.bfarm.de/DE/Das-BfArM/Aufgaben/Deutsches-Register-Klinischer-Studien/_node.html

Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences. (2016). *International ethical guidelines for health-related research involving humans* (4th Edition). CIOMS.

Du Sert, N. P., Bamsey, I., Bate, S. T., Berdoy, M., Clark, R. A., Cuthill, I. C., Fry, D., Karp, N. A., Macleod, M., Moon, L., Stanford, S. C., & Lings, B. (2017). The Experimental Design Assistant. *Nature Methods*, *14*(11), 1024–1025. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.4462

Emanuel, E. J., Wendler, D., & Grady, C. (2008). An ethical framework for biomedical research. *The Oxford textbook of clinical research ethics*, 123–135.

Lynch, H. F., Eriksen, W., & Clapp, J. T. (2022). “We measure what we can measure”: Struggles in defining and evaluating institutional review board quality. *Social Science & Medicine*, *292*, 114614. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114614

McNair, L. (2022). Ethical and regulatory oversight of clinical research: The role of the Institutional Review Board. *Experimental Biology and Medicine*, *247*(7), 561–566. https://doi.org/10.1177/15353702221078216

National Library of Medicine. (2023). *Support Materials*. https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/manage-recs/resources

Raspe, H.-H., Hüppe, A., Strech, D., & Taupitz, J. (2012). *Empfehlungen zur Begutachtung klinischer Studien durch Ethik-Kommissionen* (2., überarb. und aktualisierte Aufl). Deutscher Ärzte-Verlag.

Seykora, A., Coleman, C., Rosenfeld, S. J., Bierer, B. E., & Lynch, H. F. (2021). Steps toward a System of IRB Precedent: Piloting Approaches to Summarizing IRB Decisions for Future Use. *Ethics & Human Research*, *43*(6), 2–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/eahr.500106

Thiele, C., & Hirschfeld, G. (2022). Registration quality and availability of publications for clinical trials in Germany and the influence of structural factors. *PLOS ONE*, *17*(5), e0267883. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0267883

Viergever, R. F., Karam, G., Reis, A., & Ghersi, D. (2014). The Quality of Registration of Clinical Trials: Still a Problem. *PLOS ONE*, *9*(1), e84727. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0084727

World Health Organization. (2023). *Guidelines on submitting research proposals for ethics review*. Research Ethics Review Committee (ERC). https://www.who.int/groups/research-ethics-review-committee/guidelines-on-submitting-research-proposals-for-ethics-review

World Medical Association. (2013). World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects. *JAMA*, *310*(20), 2191–2194. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.281053