

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/101097/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Gobat, Nina , Butler, Christopher C., Webb, Steve A.R. and Nichol, Alistair 2017. Comment on Rishu et al. Time required to initiate outbreak and pandemic observational research. *Journal of Critical Care* 40 , p. 271. 10.1016/j.jcrc.2017.03.019

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2017.03.019>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Dear Editor,

We welcome the work of Rishu and colleagues [1] in tracking the timelines to initiation of outbreak and pandemic observational research. Through this work they highlight the significant challenges in being prepared with a clinical research response for the next pandemic. Pandemics are unpredictable but also recurrent. Recent experience of Ebola and Zika outbreaks highlight the devastating impact these outbreaks have on the health, economy and security of communities for generations to come.

An effective clinical research response for an outbreak relies on expedience, co-ordination, co-operation and adaptability; and compels a shift in the current paradigm of research delivery [2]. We have been encouraged by noting shifts along these lines in areas of research regulation in Europe. For example, many ethics committees in Europe now facilitate expedited review of clinical studies. These channels could be accessed in the event of an outbreak. A new regulation governing intervention studies conducted in Europe [3], effective by October 2018, makes provision for a new category of research, recognizing that not all intervention research presents the same level of risk to participants. This may facilitate comparative effectiveness research during an outbreak. New approaches to obtaining informed consent may be suited to certain kinds of pandemic research [4]

However, there remain many bottlenecks preventing the expedient setup and conduct of clinical studies during an outbreak. Many of the delays to initiation of research arise from human behavior factors: reviewing protocols, agreeing data sharing arrangements and contract agreements. While regulatory mechanisms are important and necessary to ensure integrity of research conduct, we need new ways of thinking about how to enact these protections to expedite research during a pandemic outbreak. It is vital that the public, as a major stakeholder, have a voice in this debate in how to optimize our research response. It is essential that we are able to generate the scientific advances and innovations necessary to protect our populations and in the face of the next pandemic.

## References

1. Rishu, A.H., et al., *Time required to initiate outbreak and pandemic observational research*. Journal of Critical Care.
2. Lurie, N., et al., *Research as a Part of Public Health Emergency Response*. New England Journal of Medicine, 2013. **368**(13): p. 1251-1255.
3. European Parliament and Council, *Regulation (EU) No 536/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council*. E. Union, Editor. 2014, European Union: Official Journal of the European Union.
4. Grady, C., et al., *Informed Consent*. New England Journal of Medicine, 2017. **376**(9): p. 856-867.