



EUROPE

THE ARTS
CHILD POLICY
CIVIL JUSTICE
EDUCATION
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT
HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
NATIONAL SECURITY
POPULATION AND AGING
PUBLIC SAFETY
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
SUBSTANCE ABUSE
TERRORISM AND
HOMELAND SECURITY
TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE
WORKFORCE AND WORKPLACE

This PDF document was made available from www.rand.org as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

[Jump down to document](#) ▼

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world.

Support RAND

[Browse Books & Publications](#)

[Make a charitable contribution](#)

For More Information

Visit RAND at www.rand.org

Explore [RAND Europe](#)

View [document details](#)

Limited Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law as indicated in a notice appearing later in this work. This electronic representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only. Unauthorized posting of RAND PDFs to a non-RAND Web site is prohibited. RAND PDFs are protected under copyright law. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please see [RAND Permissions](#).

This product is part of the RAND Corporation documented briefing series. RAND documented briefings are based on research briefed to a client, sponsor, or targeted audience and provide additional information on a specific topic. Although documented briefings have been peer reviewed, they are not expected to be comprehensive and may present preliminary findings.



DOCUMENTED
BRIEFING

Guiding Good Research

Biomedical Research Ethics and
Ethics Review

Observatory on Health Research
Systems

Miriam Shergold

The research described in this report was prepared as part of RAND Europe's Health Research System Observatory Documented Briefing series, funded by the English Department of Health.

The research described in this report was prepared as part of RAND Europe's Health Research System Observatory Documented Briefing series, funded by the English Department of Health.

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

RAND® is a registered trademark.

© Copyright 2008 RAND Corporation

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from RAND.

Published 2008 by the RAND Corporation
1776 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
1200 South Hayes Street, Arlington, VA 22202-5050
4570 Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Pittsburgh, PA 15213-2612
Westbrook Centre, Milton Road, Cambridge CB4 1YG, United Kingdom
RAND URL: <http://www.rand.org>
RAND Europe URL: <http://www.rand.org/randeurope>
To order RAND documents or to obtain additional information, contact
Distribution Services: Telephone: (310) 451-7002;
Fax: (310) 451-6915; Email: order@rand.org

Summary

Summary: Key Points

- The codification of universal principles for ethics in health research is a 20th century achievement that has not, however, eliminated malpractice or dispute.
- Ethics guidance emanates from a range of different sources, resulting in a 'normative polyphony'.
- Agreement on basic principles does not guarantee identical or even similar decisions on the ethical acceptability of a specific practical research endeavour.
- There are multiple models for the review process to safeguard ethical research, including choice and authority of the reviewers.
- Reviewing the ethical aspects of a research proposal is a demanding task, which researchers find burdensome and which has led to a range of streamlining efforts.

Even though consideration of the ethical aspects of biomedical research is no new phenomenon, its systematic integration into the research process has lagged behind the progress of medical discovery itself. While governments and professional bodies have taken measures to uphold standards and protect the public, cases of malpractice have made clear the need to formulate basic ground rules to be followed by all those involved in research.

By its nature, ethics guidance seeks universality and authority, yet the world has no single body that can claim to have the last word on ethics. Rather, regulations, recommendations, statements, and comments are issued by a wide range of fora within and across countries around the world. For researchers, guidance translated into national legislation has the greatest immediate relevance. Public debate on ethics is an important influence on such legislation, including the opinion of 'ordinary' citizens who some countries consult on a regular basis.

Although there is universal consensus regarding core principles, such as patient autonomy, the task of determining whether a given piece of proposed research is acceptable requires the practical interpretation of such principles. This interpretation is guided by other personal and cultural values and other contextual parameters that can lead to different outcomes. Some researchers have been disconcerted at the discovery that whereas ethical approval is key to the realisation of research projects, opinions on what is ethical may vary.

Ethics review is conducted according to a set process, and by a group of suitably qualified individuals. Given that the consideration of the ethics of a research project requires both

expert and lay views, most countries and institutions opt for a combination of scientists and non-scientists. However, there is no obvious method for mixing or appointing members, and as a result, no two models appear the same. Main differences exist in the ratio of non-specialists participating, as well as in the choice of experts, such as lawyers, psychologists, or statisticians.

Ethics review committees have to give careful and unbiased attention to each research proposal before them, but researchers are frustrated by what seem to be unduly bureaucratic and burdensome processes. In particular, the time-consuming multiple approval routes of national and international multicentre projects have been highlighted. As well as trying the patience of investigators, delays in approvals diminish the attractiveness of a given research institution to investors. Driven by the desire to combine sound ethical scrutiny with facilitated processes, different countries have devised new approval routes, such as the use of standardised forms and single review points. However, the debate on the optimum path to facilitation continues.