

Index

- Academy of Medical Sciences (AMS)
National Research Governance
Service, proposal for 68
Report (2011) 60–62, 68, 88
- ad hoc peer review 28
- adults lacking mental capacity,
research involving 12, 14, 52,
135–7
Mental Capacity Act 2005 52,
135–6, 138
- Adults with Incapacity (Scotland) Act
2000 136–7
- Al-Shami Salman, Rustam 88–9
- AMS Report (2011) 60–62, 68, 88
- Anderson, James 175–6
- anthropological theory
liminality, and 100–106
rites of passage 101–3
rituals 103–6
socio-legal studies, and 84, 92–3,
97, 106
- anthropology of regulation 4, 73, 183
benefits of 84, 95–6, 187–8
empirical research, role of 96–7
ethics review processes, and 108–30
influences on 93–6
institutionalism, and 95–6
interpretation 92
liminality, and 4, 73, 99–100
limitations of 93
observational studies 93–4
principles of 98
purpose of 92–3
reglementation studies 94–5
regulators as stewards 109, 138–57
regulatory connectivity, and 109
regulatory theory, and 96–7
scope of 4, 93–6
- applications for review 1
electronic applications 46, 58
research categories requiring 11–12
- Arm's Length Body Review 52
- Athanassoulis, Nafsika 120
- balance
equity, and 167
need for 22–4, 77–8, 111–12,
147–9, 158, 163, 166–70
proportionate regulation 86–92
protection and promotion 143–9,
164, 166–70
risk-based regulation 84–92, 168
- Baldwin, Robert 84, 104
- Beecher, Henry 34–5
- Beylveld, Deryck 22, 162
- black boxes of ethics review *see*
ethics review processes
- Black, Julia 79–80
- Building on Improvement* (2006)
55–6, 87–8
- Burns, Tom 104–5
- Burris, Scott 80, 83
- Canada 20, 59
- Care Act 2014 1, 185–6
definitions 10, 179
proportionate regulatory approach
89–90, 185–6
protection and promotion objectives
18, 64–5, 143–4, 169
regulatory requirements of 64–5
standardisation 89–90
- Cave, Emma 22
- Central Allocation System 48
- Central Booking Service 58
- Central Office for Research Ethics
Committees (COREC) 46, 48, 52

- Building on Improvement* (2006)
55–6, 87–8
participant protection 55–6
Scientific Officers 55–6
chairperson of REC, role of 121–2,
153–4
children, research involving 12, 119
circular HSC(IS) 153 (1975) 37, 42
circular HSC(97) 23 (1997) 43–5, 50
circular HSG(91) 5 (1991) 42–3
circular MH(68) 33 (1968) 35, 37
Clinical Trials Directive 22, 45, 51–2
committee flags 14
consent, of participants 7, 49, 90–91,
151, 161
Convention for the Protection of
Human Rights and Dignity of
the Human Being with Regard to
the Application of Biology and
Medicine: Convention on Human
Rights and Biomedicine (1997)
17, 50
COREC *see* Central Office for
Research Ethics Committees
Council for International
Organizations of Medical
Sciences (CIOMS) 38
CTIMP [Trials of an Investigational
Medicinal Product] 12, 14
SOPs for 51–2
Curran, William 21
- Declaration of Helsinki (2013) 8–9,
17, 37, 50, 148, 164, 169
digital Regulation Navigator 3
dignity, of participants 15, 17, 49–50,
53–4, 115, 164–5
Dunn, Michael 166–7
- electronic applications mechanism 46,
58
empirical research
analysis methods of 72–3
anthropology of regulation, role in
96–7
challenges of 58–9
data analysis 198–200
data collection procedures 196–8
data sources 189–96
evidence-based framework, for
173–4
law, and 134–8, 173
method limitations, challenges and
successes 200–202
ethics, generally
act of faith, as an 128–30
bureaucratic ethics *vs.* deliberative
ethics 176–7
discourse ethics 176–7
law and ethics, regulatory
connectivity 109, 134–8
purpose of 164
science and ethics, regulatory
connectivity 109, 131–4
space, of 113–15, 164
ethics review processes 111–30
actor involvement 114–15
anthropology of regulation, and
108–30
balance, need for 111–12, 147–9,
158, 163, 167–8
committee chairperson, role of
121–2, 153–4
connectivity 109, 113–15, 130–38
consistency 110–111, 113–14
cross-committee communication
113–14
delayed research 148
ethics and law, connectivity of
134–8
ethics and science, connectivity of
131–4
ethics as act of faith 128–30
Ethics Officers, role of 115, 155–6
ethics of space 113–15
facilitation, and 160–62
guidelines for 111
homogeneity 114–15
liminality, and 102–3, 108–9, 128,
160–66, 168–9
observation, learning by 109–30
personal values, role of 110–111,
113, 121–2, 124–6
politics, influences of 20–24
poor research design 148

- pragmatic ethics 121–3
- proportionate approach 147–9, 158
- researcher attitudes towards 139–43
- researchers, attendance of 129–30
- review categories 11–12
- risk and benefits, liberal approach to 115–21, 168–9
- rituals and routine, role of 123–8, 161–2
- robustness, monitoring for 111
- Scientific Officers, role of 55–6, 153–7
- technical questions 112
- training 110, 122–3, 135
- ethics reviews, generally
 - categories of 11–12
 - development, reasons for 76
 - regulatory theory, and 76–7
- ethics thickets 24–5
- European Union
 - Clinical Trials Directive 22, 45, 51–2
 - Clinical Trials Regulation 133
 - Good Practice Directive 17
- event licensing 8, 21–2, 112, 164
- facilitation 7–8, 160–66
- Farsides, Bobbie 160
- feedback loops 168–9, 173–4
- Friedman, Lawrence 92
- GAfREC *see* Governance
 - Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees
- gene therapy studies 14, 120–21
- Gilbert, Claire 39–40
- Good Practice Directive 17
- Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees (GAfREC) 16–17, 48–50, 54
 - authorized RECs, establishment of 14
 - participant protection, and 15, 19, 164, 173
 - proportionate regulatory approach 90–91
 - regulatory connectivity 130–31
 - research promotion, and 16–17, 19, 54, 164, 173
 - revision 63
 - risk-based regulatory approach 85, 115
 - Standard Operating Procedures, applicability 11–12
- Guidelines on the Practice of Ethics Committees in Medical Research* (RCP Guidelines, 1984) 17–19, 38–9
- Guidelines on the Practice of Ethics Committees in Medical Research* (RCP Guidelines, 1990) 40, 169
- Hancher, Leigh 78
- health law
 - Care Act 2014 1, 10, 18, 64–5, 89–90, 143–4, 169, 185–6
 - Clinical Trials Directive 22, 45, 51–2
 - definitions 10, 179
 - Good Practice Directive 17
 - Medicines for Human Use (Clinical Trials) Regulation 2004 40, 51–2, 136
 - Mental Capacity Act 2005 52, 135–6, 138
 - proportionate regulatory approach 89–90, 185–6
 - protection and promotion objectives 18, 64–5, 143–4, 169
 - regulatory requirements of 64–5
 - standardisation 89–90
- Health Research Authority
 - approval procedures 103, 156–7, 163
 - Assessment Review Portal (HARP) 67
 - background 61–3
 - controls, limitations of 67–9
 - cooperation obligations 65
 - decisional toolkits 156
 - ethics review guidelines 111
 - HRA Assessors 135, 156–7
 - objectives, balancing 143–9
 - participant protection 65, 143–9

- powers of 65, 67–8, 74–5, 82–3, 163
- proportionate regulatory approach 65–6, 88–91
- quality control checks 57
- regulatory stewardship of 150, 156–7
- researcher attitudes regarding 139–43
- research promotion 65–6, 143–9
- risk-based regulatory approach 88–91
- role of 24–5, 57, 62–5, 68, 82–3, 163
- sample Ethical Review Form 201–8
- standardisation and streamlining 64–6
- training 135
- health research, generally
 - definition 7
 - facilitation 7–8, 160–61
 - lifecycle of 174–6
 - purpose 169
 - regulatory space of 81–4
 - risk vs. benefit debate 115–19
- health research lifecycle 174–6
- Hedgecoe, Adam 32, 35, 40, 67, 70, 128–9, 166
- history of RECs
 - circular HSC(IS) 153 (1975) 37, 42
 - circular HSC(97) 23 (1997) 43–5, 50
 - circular HSG(91) 5 (1991) 42–3
 - circular MH(68) 33 (1968) 35, 37
 - developmental inconsistency 39–41
 - developmental stages 32–45
 - influences on 8–9, 76–8
 - information asymmetries, and 77
 - local vs. central control 42–3, 45
 - MRC Report 1963 32–3
 - MREC system for multi-centre studies 43–5
 - multiplicity, challenges of 45–7
 - objectives conflicts 18–24, 36–7, 47–8
 - over-regulation, and 46–7
 - participant protection 35–6, 77
 - RCP Guidelines (1984/ 1990) 38–41
 - RCP Reports (1967/ 1973) 33–8
 - Red Book [circular HSG(91) 5 (1991)] 42–3
 - scope, expansion of 37–8
 - SOPs 11–12, 43, 46, 69
 - standardisation 45–7
 - supervisory responsibility conflicts 38, 40–41
 - US funding, role of 32–3
 - whistle-blowers, role of 33–5
- Holm, Søren 22
- HRA Assessment Review Portal (HARP) 67
- Human Tissue Act 2004 52, 135, 137
- informed consent 7, 49, 90–91, 161
- instantiated regulation 5, 18, 26, 75, 108, 112, 150, 165, 182
- Institute of Medical Ethics Report (1986) 40–41
- institutionalism 95–6
- Institutional Review Boards 113 *see also* research ethics committees
- Integrated Research Application System (IRAS) 46, 58
- International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects 1982 (CIOMS) 38
- International Ethical Guidelines for Health-related Research Involving Humans 2016 (CIOMS) 9, 85, 90, 133
- IRAS 46, 48
- Jaeger, Jan Federici 115
- Johnsson, Linus 176–7
- Kerrison, Susan 68
- law, generally *see also* health law
 - definition 3
 - empirical research methods 73
 - legal anthropology 93
 - limitations of 83

- purpose of 70
- RECs, controls over 5
- regulatory connectivity with ethics
 - 109, 134–8
- regulatory space, role in 82–3, 93
- socio-legal studies 84, 92–3, 97, 106
- statutory requirements for clinical trials 134–5
- training 135
- Lee, Ronald 167
- Lewis, Peter 39
- liminality 4, 73
 - analytical benefits of 100, 103, 105–6, 168–9
 - anthropology of regulation, and 99–100
 - applicability 99–100
 - conceptual development 100–106
 - definition 99
 - disciplinary perspective 102
 - ethics review processes, and 108–9, 128, 168–9
 - phases of 166
 - regulatory processes, and 102–3, 128, 160–66
 - regulatory stewardship, and 160–66
 - risk-based regulation, and 100
 - rites of passage 101–3
 - rituals, role of 103–6
- Lord Warner Report 2005 53–5, 87–8, 153
- Machado, Nora 104–5
- Manual for Research Ethics Committees* (2003) 18
- May, William 31
- medical devices, research involving
 - use of 12
- medicinal products, research involving
 - use of *see* CTIMP
- Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency 40
- Medicines Control Agency 40
- Medicines for Human Use (Clinical Trials) Regulation 2004 8, 11, 15, 30, 40, 51–2, 68, 134, 136
- Mental Capacity Act 2005 52, 135–6, 138
- meta-ethical reflection 112
- Meyer, Michelle 87, 118, 168
- Montgomery, Jonathan 112
- Moore, Sally Falk 94–6
- moral reasoning, influences of 121–2
- Moran, Michael 78
- multi-centre trials
 - MREC system 43–5
 - regulatory controls 51–2
- National Institute of Health Research 56
- National Patient Safety Agency 52
- National Research Ethics and Advisors' Panel (NREAP) 56–7
- National Research Ethics Service (NRES) 56–7
- National Research Governance Service 68
- National Social Care REC 10
- Neuberger, Julia 41–3
- New Zealand 20, 179
- NHS RECs *see also* research ethics committees
 - appointments 11
 - authority, recognition of 12–13
 - authorized RECs 14
 - balance vs. optimization 23–4
 - committee flags 14
 - definition 10
 - development 14–15
 - meetings 13–14
 - membership 10–11
 - objectives conflicts 18–24, 36–7
 - overview 9–14
 - participant protection 15–16, 18–24, 31, 111–12, 164
 - political influences 20–24
 - power dynamics 20–21, 163
 - Proportionate Review 13, 57, 88, 90–91, 141
 - recognized RECs 14
 - regional locations 12–13
 - reports, publication of 13–14
 - Research Ethics Service 9–10

- research promotion 16–24, 54–6, 64–6
- review categories 11–12
- roles of 14–24
- SOPs 11–12, 43
- time limits 13–14, 51
- Noah, Lars 117
- nodal governance 80–83
- Northern Ireland, RECs in 11, 13
- North Staffordshire research scandal 45–6

- observation, learning by 109–30
- online applications mechanism 46, 58
- organisational deviance 128–9, 166
- Oviedo Convention (1997) 17, 50

- Pappworth, Maurice 33–5
- participant consent 7, 49, 90–91, 151, 161
- Participant Information Sheets 111–12
- participant protection
 - consent 7, 49, 90–91, 151, 161
 - dignity, rights and safety 15, 17, 49–50, 53–4, 115, 164–5
 - ethics review guidelines 111–12
 - fair choice 161
 - REC policy development 15–16, 18–24, 31, 35–6, 54–6, 77
 - research promotion, balancing with 143–9, 164, 166–70
 - risk vs. benefits debate 115–21, 168–9
- participant protection, and 111–12, 143–9, 164
- Patterson, Robert 167
- personal values, role of 110–111, 113, 121–2, 124–6
- politics, influences on research ethics policies 20–24
- Pollock, Allyson 68
- polycentric governance 80–83, 163
- poor research design 148
- pragmatic ethics 121–3
- predictability 127–8
- prisoners, research involving 12, 14
- proportionate regulation 86–92
 - limitations of 88–9
 - SOPs 90–91
 - trends 87–8
- proportionate reviews 13, 57–8, 63, 141, 147–9, 158
- Proportionate Review Service (PRS) 57–8, 90

- RED (Research Ethics Database) 46, 58
- Red Book (circular HSG(91) 5 (1991)) 42–3
- reglementation studies 94–5
- Regulation for the Fourth Industrial Revolution* (2019) 2–3
- regulation, generally
 - anthropology of (*see* anthropology of regulation)
 - balance, need for 22–4, 77–8, 163, 167–8
 - definition 3
 - development trends 27–9
 - ethics of space 173–4
 - event licensing 8, 21–2, 112, 164
 - instantiated regulation 5, 18, 26, 75, 108, 112, 150, 165, 182
 - normative model for 166–7, 171–80, 183–4
 - purpose 19, 84, 96
 - reforms, impact of 1, 29–30
 - regulatory connectivity 174
 - regulatory conversations 174–6, 185
 - regulatory flexibility 171–2, 184–5
 - regulatory lifecycle 174–6
 - regulatory processes 21–2
 - restrictions on 163–4
 - self-regulation vs. state regulatory control 38
 - trickle-down effect 27, 29
- regulatory connectivity 109, 130–38, 159–60, 164–5, 174
 - spaces within 159–60
- regulatory conversations 159–60, 166, 174–6, 185
 - feedback loops 168–9, 173–4
- regulatory flexibility 75–6, 159–60, 165–6, 171–2, 184–5

- regulatory processes 21–2
 - institutionalist approach 95–6
 - liminality, and 102–3, 128, 160–66, 168–9
- regulatory space 76, 78–84, 99
 - HRA, of 81–4
 - institutionalist approach 95–6
 - interpretation 78–80
 - law, role in 82–3, 93
 - nodal governance, and 80–83
 - polycentric governance, and 80–83, 163
 - regulatory connectivity, and 159–60
 - relevance of 78–9
 - resources, interaction with 78–80
 - topology of 83–4
 - use of 80–84
- regulatory stewardship
 - anthropology of regulation, and 109, 138–57
 - balance, need for 143–9, 163
 - chairperson, by 121–2, 153–4
 - definitions 149, 179
 - embeddedness of 165–6
 - Ethics Officers 115, 155–6
 - frameworks for 174–6
 - gatekeeping 150–51
 - HRA role 150
 - interests and responsibilities 139–43, 149, 160–61, 177–8, 185
 - legal basis for 179
 - liminality, and 160–66
 - managers, by 153–4, 156–7
 - methods and approaches 150–57
 - oversight, responsibility for 138–9, 160–61
 - participant protection and research promotion, balancing 143–9, 164, 166–70
 - principles of 179–80
 - purpose of 149–50, 160–61
 - RECs and researchers, relationships between 139–43
 - research proposal modification, and 151–2
 - research vs. audit role 152
 - Scientific Officers, by 55–6, 153–7, 178
 - stages and levels of 152–3, 179–80
 - work groups 128–9, 166, 179–80
- regulatory theory
 - anthropology of regulation, and 96–7
 - authority, levels of 75
 - definition 74
 - ethics reviews, and 76–7
 - instantiated regulation 75
 - law, role in 82–3
 - limitations 91–2
 - polycentric regulation 80–82
 - proportionate regulation 86–92
 - RECs, of 74–5
 - risk-based regulation 84–92
 - rituals, role in 104–6
 - role of 74, 80
 - state vs. non-state controls 80–82
- researchers, attendance of 129–30
- research ethics boards *see* research ethics committees
- research ethics committees
 - additional research suggestions 186–7
 - applications reviewed, trends 1
 - appointments to 11
 - attendance 177
 - authority, recognition of 12–13
 - authorized RECs 14
 - balance vs. optimization 23–4, 77–8, 163, 166–70
 - committee flags 14
 - criticisms of 58–61, 68–70
 - government responses to 59–69
 - over-regulation 59–60
 - self-regulation 59
 - definitions 10
 - development of 14–15
 - circular HSC(IS) 153 (1975) 37, 42
 - circular HSC(97) 23 (1997) 43–5, 50
 - circular HSG(91) 5 (1991) 42–3
 - circular MH(68) 33 (1968) 35, 37
 - inconsistency of 39–41

- influences on 8–9, 76–8
- information asymmetries, and 77
- local vs. central control 42–3, 45
- MRC Report 1963 32–3
- MREC system for multi-centre studies 43–5
- multiplicity, challenges of 45–7
- objectives conflicts 18–24, 36–7, 47–8
- over-regulation, and 46–7
- participant protection 35–6, 77
- RCP Guidelines (1984/ 1990) 38–41
- RCP Reports (1967/ 1973) 33–8
- scope, expansion of 37–8
- SOPs 11–12, 43, 46, 69
- stages of 32–45
- standardisation 45–7
- supervisory responsibility
 - conflicts 38, 40–41
- US funding, role of 32–3
- whistle-blowers, role of 33–5
- engagement with other RECs 113–14
- ethics review processes (*see* ethics review processes)
- EU Clinical Trials Directive, compliance with 51–2
- importance of 1, 31–2
- meetings 13–14, 177
- membership 10–11
- objectives conflicts 18–24, 36–7
- overview 8–14
- participant protection 15–16, 18–24, 31, 35–6, 54–6, 77, 111–12, 164
- political influences on 20–24
- power dynamics 2, 20–21, 163
- proportionate regulation 87–8
- Proportionate Reviews 13
- public vs. private interests 77–8
- recognised RECs 14
- reforms 25–6
 - AMS Report (2010) 60–62, 68, 88
 - Central Allocation System 48
 - consolidation 67
 - COREC, role of 46, 48
 - efficiency 66–7, 69
 - HRA, establishment of (*see* Health Research Authority)
 - Lord Warner Report 53–5
 - National Institute of Health Research 56
 - need for 186
 - participant protection 54–6
 - reasons for 45–7
 - Research Governance Framework 46, 48–50, 52–3
 - Shared Ethical Debate scheme (ShED) 56–7
- regional locations 12–13
- regulatory development, and 14–15, 27–9, 31–2
- reports, publication of 13–14
- researcher attitudes towards 139–43
- research promotion 16–24, 54–6, 64–6, 108, 143–9, 164
- review categories 11–12
- risk-based regulation, and 85–92, 161–2
- role of 1, 8–9, 14–24, 31–2, 162
 - educational promotion 173
 - independence, and 74
 - objective conflicts 18–24, 36–7, 47–8
 - participant protection 15–16, 18–24, 31, 35–6, 54–6, 77, 111–12, 164
 - political influences on 20–24
 - primary vs. secondary responsibilities 15–17, 49–50, 54, 59, 63
 - regulatory theory, and 74–5
 - research promotion 16–24, 54–6, 64–6, 108, 143–9, 164
- Standard Operating Procedures 11–12, 43, 46, 51–2, 57
- time limits 13–14, 51
- Research Ethics Database 46, 58
- research ethics, generally
 - purpose of 31–2
 - review processes (*see* ethics review processes)
- Research Ethics Service (NHS) 9–10

- research governance *see also* Health Research Authority
 efficiency improvement proposals 66–7, 69
 proposals for 61–2
 Research Governance Framework for Health and Social Care (RGF) 46, 48–50, 52–3, 66
 research promotion
 GAfREC 16–17, 54
 participant protection, balancing with 143–9, 164, 166–70
 REC role in 16–18, 54–6, 64–6, 108
 Rid, Annette 91, 115
 rights and safety of participants 15, 17, 49–50, 53–4, 115, 164–5
 risk-based regulation 84–92, 115
 definition 85–6, 116
 liminality, and 100
 limitations of 87, 116–17
 RECs, role in 85–7, 161–2
 scope of 116–17
 SOPs 90–91
 trends 87–8
 risk-related decision-making
 ethics review, role in 115–21, 168–9
 gene therapy studies 120–21
 high-risk/ unknown risk treatments for critical illness 120–21
 research involving children 119
 tolerance, role of 168–9, 173
 rites of passage
 anthropological theory of 101–3
 rituals 103–6
 anthropological theory of 103–6
 ethics review, role in 108–9, 123–8, 161–2
 expertise, of 126–7
 Robertson, John 31
 Ross, Allison 120
 Royal College of Physicians
 RCP Guidelines (1984) 17–19, 38–9, 164–5
 RCP Guidelines (1990) 40, 169
 RCP Guidelines (2017) 18–19
 Report (1967) 33–4
 Report (1973) 35–6
 Sarat, Austin 93
 satellite regulator model 76
 Schneider, Carl 112
 science, generally
 regulatory connectivity with ethics 109, 131–4
 Scientific Officers 55–6, 121, 153–7, 178
 Scotland, RECs in 11, 13, 67, 153–5
 Scott, Colin 79, 83
 self-regulation 9, 21, 28, 59, 76
 Shared Ethical Debate scheme (ShED) 56–7, 141–2
 Single Issue Debate 56
 social care services, research involving use of 12
 socio-legal studies 84, 92–3, 97, 106
 space, ethics of 113–15, 164, 173–4
 Standard Operating Procedures
 CTIMPS, for 51–2
 NHS RECs, for 11–12, 43, 46, 57, 69, 172
 risk-based and proportionate regulatory approaches, and 90–91
 Stark, Laura 32, 76, 113
 stem cell clinical trials 14
 Stephens, Neil 75–6, 118
 stewards, regulators as *see* regulatory stewardship
 Szakolczai, Árpád 102–3, 138–9
 technical questions 112
 Thalidomide 33
 Thomassen, Bjørn 99, 102
 Thompson, Ian 39
 time limits 13–14, 51
 tolerance, role of 168–9, 173
 training, for ethics reviews 110, 122–3, 135
 UK Ethics Committee Authority (UKECA) 57, 68–9

- UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research (2017) 30, 66, 89
- UK Stem Cell Bank 75, 91–2
- United States
- ethics reviews, development of 76–7
 - regulatory processes 23, 59
 - risk and benefits, review approaches to 115–16
- van Gennep, Arnold 100–101
- Veatch, Robert 23
- Wales, RECs in 13
- Warnock, Mary 122
- whistle-blowers 33–5
- Whitney, Simon 167
- Wilson, Duncan 34
- work groups 128–9, 166, 179–80