7.5 Additional Considerations

7.5.1 Determination of Risk

At the time of initial and continuing review, the IRB will make a determination regarding the risks associated with the research plan. Risks associated with the research will generally be classified as either “minimal” or “greater than minimal” with additional classifications as required by the various subparts or FDA regulations. Risk determinations may vary over the life of a research plan depending on the procedures and risks that subjects will be exposed to as the research progresses. The level of risk associated with the research influences eligibility for expedited review. The meeting minutes will reflect the convened IRB’s determination regarding risk levels; expedited reviewers will document the determination of risk level on the IRB reviewer form or certification checklist.

7.5.2 Period of Approval

At the time of initial review and at continuing review, the IRB will make a determination regarding the period of approval. All studies will be reviewed by the IRB at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk but no less than once per year. In some circumstances, a shorter review interval (e.g., semi-annually, quarterly, or after accrual of a specific number of participants) may be required (see below). The meeting minutes will reflect the convened IRB’s determination regarding review frequency; expedited reviewers will document the determination of risk level on the IRB review or certification checklist.

IRB approval is considered to have lapsed at midnight on the expiration date of the approval (i.e., the expiration date is the last day research can be conducted). For a new study reviewed by the IRB, the approval commences on the date that the IRB conducts its final review of the study; that is, the date that the convened IRB or expedited reviewer approves the research or the date that it is verified that the requirements of the IRB have been satisfied following an action of “Conditions Required for Approval”. The expiration date of the initial approval period, which is the date by which the first continuing review must occur, may be as late as one year after the last determination of approval or approvable with conditions.

For all continuing reviews of a research study subject to convened board review, the date the convened IRB or the date that the expedited reviewer conducts continuing review and approves the study (with or without conditions) determines the latest permissible date of the next continuing review.

The approval date and approval expiration date are clearly noted on IRB determination letters and must be strictly adhered to. Investigators should allow sufficient time for development and review of continuing review submissions.

IRB review of a proposed modification to research ordinarily does not alter the date by which continuing review must occur. This is because continuing review is review of the full research project, not simply a change to it.
The regulations make no provision for any grace period extending the conduct of research beyond the expiration date of IRB approval. Therefore, continuing review and re-approval of research must occur by midnight of the date when IRB approval expires. If the IRB performs continuing review within 30 days before the IRB approval period expires, the IRB may retain the anniversary date as the date by which the continuing review must occur.

7.5.3 Review More Often Than Annually

The following factors will be considered when determining which studies require review more frequently than on an annual basis:

1. The probability and magnitude of anticipated risks to subjects.
2. The likely medical/psychological/social/legal/educational condition of the proposed subjects.
3. The overall qualifications of the investigator and other members of the research team.
4. The specific experience of the investigator and other members of the research team in conducting similar research.
5. The nature and frequency of adverse events observed in similar research at this and other institutions.
6. The novelty of the research making unanticipated adverse events/unanticipated problems more likely.
7. The involvement of especially vulnerable populations likely to be subject to undue influence or coercion (e.g., terminally ill)
8. A history of serious or continuing non-compliance on the part of the investigator.
9. Any other factors that the IRB deems relevant.

In specifying an approval period of less than one year, the IRB may define the period with either a time interval or a maximum number of subjects either studied or enrolled. If a maximum number of subjects studied or enrolled is used to define the approval period, it is understood that the approval period in no case can exceed one year and that the number of subjects studied or enrolled determines the approval period only when that number of subjects is studied or enrolled in less than one year. If an approval period of less than one year is specified by the IRB, the reason for more frequent review must be documented in the minutes, the reviewer’s checklist or electronic comments.

7.5.4 Independent Verification That No Material Changes Have Occurred

The IRB recognizes that protecting the rights and welfare of subjects sometimes requires that the IRB use sources other than the investigator to independently verify that no material changes occurred during the IRB-designated approval period.
The IRB will determine the need for verification from outside sources on a case-by-case basis. The following factors will be considered when determining which studies require independent verification:

1. The probability and magnitude of anticipated risks to subjects.
2. The likely medical/psychological/social/legal/educational condition of the proposed subjects.
3. The probable nature and frequency of changes that may ordinarily be expected in the type of research proposed.
4. Concern about possible material changes occurring without IRB approval have been raised based on information provided in continuing review reports or from other sources.
5. Investigators who have previously failed to comply with federal regulations and/or the requirements or determinations of the IRB.
6. Research without a routine monitoring plan.
7. Any other factors the IRB deems verification from outside sources is relevant.

In making determinations about independent verification, the IRB may prospectively require that such verification take place at predetermined intervals during the approval period, or may require such verification at the time of continuing review, review of modification requests and/or unanticipated problems.

If any material changes have occurred without IRB review and approval, the IRB will decide the corrective action to be taken (see Section 16 on Non-compliance).

7.5.5 Consent Monitoring

In reviewing the adequacy of informed consent procedures for proposed research, the IRB may on occasion determine that special monitoring of the consent process by an impartial observer (e.g., consent monitor) is required in order to reduce the possibility of coercion and undue influence, ensure that the approved consent process is being followed, or ensure that subjects are truly giving informed consent.

Such monitoring may be particularly warranted for:

1. High risk studies;
2. Studies that involve particularly complicated procedures or interventions;
3. Studies involving highly vulnerable populations (e.g., ICU patients, children who are wards);
4. Studies involving study staff with minimal experience in administering consent to potential study participants; or
5. Other situations when the IRB has concerns that consent process may not be/is not being conducted appropriately (e.g., prior investigator non-compliance, etc.).
Monitoring may also be appropriate as a corrective action where the IRB has identified problems associated with a particular investigator or a research project.

If the IRB determines that consent monitoring is required, the IRB Members will determine the requirements for consent monitoring. The consent monitoring may be conducted by University of Virginia Post Approval Monitoring (PAM) Staff. The investigator and PAM Office will be notified of the IRB’s determination and the reasons for the determination. PAM staff will make arrangements with the investigator for the monitoring of the consent process, typically for a specified number of subjects. When observing the consent process, the monitor will determine:

- Whether the informed consent process was appropriately conducted and documented;
- Whether the participant had sufficient time to consider study participation;
- Whether the consent process involved coercion or undue influence;
- Whether the information was accurate and conveyed in understandable language; and
- Whether the subject appeared to understand the information and gave their voluntary consent.

Following the monitoring, a report of the findings will be submitted to the IRB, which will determine the appropriate action to be taken.

### 7.5.6 Investigator Qualifications

The IRB research application asks specific questions regarding the investigator and research team’s credentials to determine whether investigators and members of the research team are appropriately qualified to conduct the research. The IRB may rely upon other University of Virginia processes (e.g., credentialing) to inform this determination.

### 7.5.7 Investigator Conflicts of Interest (COI)

The IRB research application asks specific questions regarding the investigator and research team compliance with disclosure requirements and whether or not any COI management plans are in place. As part of its review process, the IRB will make a final determination as to whether any conflict of interest is adequately addressed and protects the human subjects in the research. The IRB has final authority to determine whether the declared COI and the management plan, if any, allow the study to be approved. (See Section 21 for a more detailed discussion of COI)

### 7.5.8 Institutional Conflicts of Interest

As with individual conflict of interest, the IRB has final authority to determine whether the Institutional Conflict, the Financial Interest, and the management plan, if any, allow the study to be approved. See Section 21.3 for a more detailed discussion of Institutional COI.
7.5.9 Significant New Findings

During the course of research, significant new knowledge or findings about the research, the test article, and/or the condition under study may develop. The investigator must report any significant new findings to the IRB and the IRB will review them with regard to the impact on the subjects’ rights and welfare. Because the new knowledge or findings may affect the risks or benefits to subjects or subjects' willingness to continue in the research, the IRB may require, during the ongoing review process, that the investigator contact the currently enrolled subjects to inform them of the new information. The IRB will communicate this requirement to the investigator. If the study is still enrolling subjects, the consent document should be updated. IRB may require that the currently enrolled subjects be re-consented or otherwise provided with the new information. The IRB may also require that former subjects be provided with the new information, e.g., if it impacts their rights or welfare.

7.5.10 Advertisements and Recruitment Materials

The IRB must review and approve any and all advertisements prior to posting and/or distribution for studies that are conducted under the purview of the University of Virginia. The IRB will review:

1. The information contained in the advertisement.
2. The mode/method of its communication.
3. The final copy of printed advertisements.
4. The proposed script and final audio/video taped advertisements.

This information should be submitted to the IRB with the initial application or, if recruitment is proposed after study approval, as a modification request.

The IRB reviews the material to assure that the material is accurate and is not coercive or unduly optimistic, creating undue influence to the subject to participate. This includes but is not limited to:

1. Statements implying a certainty of favorable outcome or other benefits beyond what was outlined in the consent document and the research plan.
2. Claims, either explicitly or implicitly, that the test article (drug, biologic or device) is safe or effective for the purposes under investigation.
3. Claims, either explicitly or implicitly, that the test article was known to be equivalent or superior to any other drug, biologic or device.
4. Using terms like “new treatment,” “new medication,” or “new drug” without explaining that the test article was investigational.
5. Promising “free medical treatment” when the intent was only to say participants will not be charged for taking part in the investigation.
6. Emphasis on payment or the amount to be paid, such as bold type or larger font on printed media.

7. Offers for a coupon good for a discount on the purchase price of an investigational product once it has been approved for marketing.

8. The inclusion of exculpatory language.

Recruitment materials should be limited to the information the prospective subjects need to determine their eligibility and interest. When appropriately worded, the following items may be included:

1. The name and address of the investigator and/or research facility.
2. The condition being studied and/or the purpose of the research.
3. In summary form, the criteria that will be used to determine eligibility for the study.
4. The time or other commitment required of the subjects.
5. The location of the research and the person or office to contact for further information.
6. A clear statement that this is research and not treatment.
7. A brief list of potential benefits (e.g., no-cost health exam).

Once approved by the IRB, an advertisement cannot be altered or manipulated in any way without prior IRB approval.

Directory listings of research such as ClinicalTrials.Gov are not considered advertisements and therefore do not require IRB review and approval if the listing is limited to the following basic trial information: title, purpose of the study, research plan summary, basic eligibility criteria, study site location(s), and how to contact the study site for further information.

The first contact prospective study subjects make is often with a person who follows a script to determine basic eligibility for the specific study. The IRB should assure the procedures followed adequately protect the rights and welfare of the prospective subjects.

### 7.5.11 Payments to Research Subjects

Payment to research subjects may be an incentive for participation or a way to reimburse a subject for travel and other experiences incurred due to participation. However, payment for participation is not considered a research benefit. Regardless of the form of remuneration, investigators must take care to avoid unduly influencing subjects. The amount of compensation must be proportional to the time and inconveniences posed by participation in the study.

Investigators who wish to pay research subjects must submit to the IRB the amount and schedule of all payments. Investigators should indicate in their research project application the justification for such payment. Such justification should substantiate that proposed payments are reasonable and commensurate with the expected contributions of the subject and do not constitute (or appear to constitute) undue pressure on the potential subject to volunteer for the research study.
The IRB must review both the amount of payment and the proposed method and timing of disbursement to assure that neither entails problems of coercion or undue influence.

Credit for payment should be prorated and not be contingent upon the participant completing the entire study. The IRB does not allow the entire payment to be contingent upon completion of the entire study. Any amount paid as bonus for completion of the entire study should not be so great that it could unduly induce subjects to remain in the study when they otherwise would have withdrawn.

The consent form must describe the terms of payment including the amount and schedule of payments and any conditions under which subjects would receive partial payment (e.g., if they withdraw from the study before their participation is completed) or no payment.

Unless the study is confidential, the University of Virginia Procurement Office requires identifying information to issue checks, cash, or gift certificates to subjects. The consent form must inform subjects that they will be asked to provide their Social Security Number to receive payment.

**7.5.12 Non-Monetary Gifts and Incentives**

Similar to financial incentives, non-monetary gifts or incentives can also present problems of undue influence or coercion that impact a potential subject’s ability to fully and freely consider participation in research.

If subjects will be provided with non-monetary gifts or tokens of appreciation, such as totes, books, toys, or other such materials, the item and approximate retail value must be submitted to the IRB.

The IRB will review all gifts and incentives being particularly sensitive to the influence of power or authority, whether perceived or actual, over free decision-making. Overt coercion (e.g., threatening loss of credit, or access to services or programs, to which the potential subjects are otherwise entitled) is never appropriate. Moreover, it must be clear that choosing to not participate will not adversely affect an individual’s relationship with the organization or its staff or the provision of services in any way (e.g., loss of credits or access to programs).

Investigators should carefully structure incentives and methods of disbursement so that while the incentives may serve as a factor in a subjects decision to participate, that they have not served to unduly influence or coerce participation.

**7.5.13 State and Local Laws**

The IRB considers and adheres to all applicable state and local laws in the jurisdictions where the research is taking place. The IRB relies on the University of Virginia Counsel for the interpretation and application of Virginia law and the laws of any other jurisdiction where research is conducted as they apply to human subjects research. The IRB will ensure that consent forms are consistent with applicable state and local laws.