

# Ethical Considerations in Human Subjects Research

Stacey Berg, M.D.  
Associate Dean for Research Assurances  
Baylor College of Medicine

# Code of Hammurabi, ~1750 BCE

---



215. If a physician make a large incision with an operating knife and cure it, or if he open a tumor (over the eye) with an operating knife, and saves the eye, he shall receive ten shekels in money.

218. If a physician make a large incision with the operating knife, and kill him, or open a tumor with the operating knife, and cut out the eye, his hands shall be cut off.

221. If a physician heal the broken bone or diseased soft part of a man, the patient shall pay the physician five shekels in money.

# Code of Medical Ethics, 1803

.... It is for the public good....that new remedies and new methods of chirurgical treatment should be devised. But...the faculty should be scrupulously and conscientiously governed by sound reason, just analogy, or well authenticated facts. And no such trials should be instituted, without a previous consultation of the physicians or surgeons.

Thomas Percival

## Guess Who...

---

4. Any innovative therapy must be justified and performed in accordance with the principles of medical ethics and the rules of medical practice and theory. In all cases, the question of whether any adverse effects which may occur are proportionate to the anticipated benefits shall be examined and assessed.

5. Innovative therapy may be carried out only after the subject or his legal representative has unambiguously consented to the procedure in the light of relevant information provided in advance.

10. A report shall be made in respect of any innovative therapy, indicating the purpose of the procedure, the justification for it, and the manner in which it is carried out.

# Nuremberg Code, 1947

## *"Permissible Medical Experiments"*

- Voluntary consent
- "Fruitful results for the good of society"
- Protection of subject from risks
- Good faith, superior skill, and careful judgement of researcher

# Regulatory Milestones

- **1953 DoD Top Secret memo**  
principles of the Nuremberg Code  
no prisoners of war  
approval of the Secretary
- **1953–1961 NIH Clinical Center**  
independent review of research  
participants' written consent
- **1962: Kefauver– Harris amendments**  
FDA to evaluate new drug safety  
required informed consent

# Regulatory Milestones

- **1966: PHS**  
independent review of research  
committee of the investigator's "institutional  
associates"
- **1966 Beecher article**  
22 examples of unethical/questionable research  
all published in major medical journals
- **1971: DHEW "Yellow Book"**  
justification, guidance for review committees

# Regulatory Milestones

- 1974: National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavior Research  
1979 Belmont Report
- 1981: HHS/FDA revised regulations  
45 CFR 46 (The Common Rule)  
21 CFR 50,56
- 1981: President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research

# Belmont Report, 1979

## *Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects*

- **Respect for Persons**  
Dignity, autonomy of individuals–informed consent  
additional protection for vulnerable subjects
- **Beneficence**  
maximize potential benefit  
minimize potential risk (nonmaleficence)
- **Justice**  
Fairness in selection of who bears risks and gets benefits

# Definition of Research

- **Research** means a *systematic* investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to *generalizable knowledge*

**Not based on publication plans  
(but publishers will ask!)**

# Definition of Subject

- **Human subject** means a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains:

(1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual

(2) identifiable private information



# Criteria for IRB approval

- Risks to subjects are minimized
- Risks to subjects are reasonable relative to benefits
- Selection of subjects is equitable
- Provisions made for data, safety monitoring
- Provisions made to protect confidentiality
- Safeguards in place for vulnerable subjects
- Informed consent will be sought, documented

How do you do ethical  
research (and meet criteria  
for approval) ?

Do good science!

Risks minimized, potential  
benefits maximized

## *Study Design*

- Good endpoints
- Appropriate sample size
- Leverage clinical procedures
- Adequate data analysis plan
  - Protocol endpoints
  - Safety monitoring
- Less risky way to get answer?

# Risk-benefit ratio favorable

- How much risk?
  - To individual
  - To family?
  - To society?
- How much benefit?
  - To individual
  - To society

# Confidentiality

- **Consider subject privacy**  
Where you'll talk  
How intrusive?
- **Safeguard confidentiality of data**  
Locked doors  
Password protected files
- **Consider risks if confidentiality breached**  
Genetic info- parentage, insurance  
Psychological harm  
Job status
- **Who gets access, what circumstances**
- **What happens to samples/data**



# Subject selection fair

## *Inclusion/exclusion criteria*

- Equitable distribution of risk
- Equitable distribution of potential benefit
- Various factors to consider
  - Socioeconomic background
  - Gender
  - Minorities
  - Non-English speakers

# Good faith, superior skill, and careful judgment

“The roles of clinician and scientist must be integrated to manage conscientiously the ethical complexity, ambiguity, and tensions between the potentially competing loyalties of science and care of volunteer patients.”

# The Researcher's Job

Find out the answer to  
the question!

(safely and with respect for subjects'  
welfare)

# The MD's Job

Take the best care of  
the patient!

(logically and with respect for  
information to be gained)

# The Physician-Researcher

PI advocates  
for study

Physician advocates for  
patient



Whose side are you on?

# Two-headed lizard whose heads hate each other discovered in Australia



Buzz up! 0 votes | Send | Share | Print

TreeHugger.com – 1 hr 5 mins ago



Photos via [Metro](#)

Check out this [bizarre two-headed bobtail lizard](#) that was discovered a couple of days ago in Perth Australia! Also [it turns out that the heads hate each other](#), and the larger one keeps attacking the smaller one.

# Helsinki Declaration

*52nd WMA General Assembly,  
Edinburgh, Scotland, October 2000*

“The physician may combine medical research with medical care, only to the extent that the research is justified by its potential prophylactic, diagnostic or therapeutic value.”

# Informed consent

## *Basic elements*

- What the research is
- Procedures involved
- Risks, benefits
- Treatment/compensation for injury
- Alternatives
- Right to withdraw
- Confidentiality
- Contacts for questions



# Informed consent

## *Additional elements*

- Unforeseeable risks
- Circumstances for termination of participation
- Additional costs
- Procedures for withdrawal
- Notification of new findings that might affect willingness to participate
- Approximate number of subjects

# Special genetics considerations

- Is the data itself PHI?
- Are there special risks?
  - Insurability
  - Employability
  - Law enforcement access
  - Stress/embarrassment/"group harm"
- Return of research results?
- Research beyond original description/  
consent?

The undersigned, Antonio Benigno *Antonio Benigno*  
being more than twenty-five years of age, native of Ceroeda,  
in the province of Corima, the son of Manuel Benigno  
and Josefa Castro here states by these presents, being in  
the enjoyment and exercise of his own very free will, that he consents  
to submit himself to experiments for the purpose of determining the  
methods of transmission of yellow fever, made upon his person by the  
Commission appointed for this purpose by the Secretary of War of the  
United States, and that he gives his consent to undergo the said ex-  
periments for the reasons and under the conditions below stated.

The undersigned understands perfectly well that in case of the  
development of yellow fever in him, that he endangers his life to a  
certain extent but it being entirely impossible for him to avoid the  
infection during his stay in this island, he prefers to take the  
chance of contracting it intentionally in the belief that he will  
receive from the said Commission the greatest care and the most skill-  
ful medical service.

It is understood that at the completion of these experiments, with-  
in two months from this date, the undersigned will receive the sum of  
\$100 in American gold and that in case of his contracting yellow fever  
at any time during his residence in this camp, he will receive in addi-  
tion to that sum a further sum of \$100 in American gold, upon his re-  
covery and that in case of his death because of this disease, the  
Commission will transmit the said sum (two hundred American dollars)  
to the person whom the undersigned shall designate at his convenience.

The undersigned binds himself not to leave the bounds of this camp  
during the period of the experiments and will forfeit all right to the  
benefits named in this contract if he breaks this agreement.

And to bind himself he signs this paper in duplicate, in the Experi-  
mental Camp, near Quemados, Cuba, on the 26th day of November  
nineteen hundred.

On the part of the Commission:

Walter Reed  
Maj. & Surg., U.S.A.

The contracting party,

Antonio Benigno

# The trouble with informed consent....

*...is that it is uneducated consent  
(Inglefinger)*

- 2709 words (11 pages), 12<sup>th</sup> grade level (and getting longer)
- Therapeutic misconception (patient thinks the intervention is about him)
- Concepts just plain hard

# Comprehension

## *Belmont report*

- The manner and context in which information is conveyed is as important as the information itself.
- Investigators are responsible for ascertaining that the subject has comprehended the information.

# Guess when.....

- “The patient, asked to sign countless... consents, may respond with a blanket refusal or a pro forma signature.”

# Enhancing consent

- Decision aids?  
better knowledge options, outcomes  
more accurate perceptions outcome  
probabilities
- More time to decide?
- Neutral third party to assess  
comprehension?
- Better neuroscience!

# Informed consent

- Tell people why you're doing this and what's going to happen to them!
- Risks (not underestimated)
- Benefits (not oversold)
- 7<sup>th</sup> (8<sup>th</sup>? 10<sup>th</sup>?) grade language



# Explain it like you would to friend

- Why you're doing this (context)
- What's going to happen to them
- Difference between standard care and research procedures
- Risks (not underestimated)
- Benefits (not oversold)
- Options
- Format for easy reading?

# Start at beginning

- Good science makes good protocols
- Good communication makes good consents
- IRB wants to approve your research!

# Helpful links

- 45 CFR 46  
<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm#46.111>
- Belmont Report  
<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.htm>
- NIH guide on informed consent  
[http://www4.od.nih.gov/oba/rac/ic/appendix\\_m\\_iii\\_b.html](http://www4.od.nih.gov/oba/rac/ic/appendix_m_iii_b.html)
- Data monitoring  
<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/not98-084.html>
- IRB Manual  
[https://intranet.bcm.edu/apps/research/oor/a\\_c/document/irb\\_manual.pdf](https://intranet.bcm.edu/apps/research/oor/a_c/document/irb_manual.pdf)
- NIH GWAS guidance  
<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/gwas/>