WORKSHEET: Considerations for Ceding IRB Review



| r | | | |
|------|------------------|------------|--------|
| arch | NUMBER | DATE | PAGE |
| | 13.202 (HRP-832) | 11/21/2024 | 1 of 1 |

| comme or IRB | Irpose of this worksheet is to provide considerations that the institution may evaluate when considering requests to outsource review to a ercial IRB or to require a pSite's IRB to serve as sIRB. This worksheet may be used as a working document for the Reliance Administrator staff during the process of evaluation and may be saved until a determination has been made. eneral Exclusion Criteria. The following are circumstances in which the institution <u>will not</u> cede IRB review for a multisite study. The institution does not maintain an OHRP-approved Federalwide Assurance (FWA) The institution is not engaged in the research activities. The study is determined to not involve <u>Human Research</u> . The study is determined to be Exempt. |
|-----------------|---|
| fo | onsiderations to Cede IRB Review to Commercial IRBs. The institution will evaluate on a case-by-case basis ceding IRB review. The llowing characteristics of the study will be evaluated to determine whether to cede IRB review to a Commercial IRB (e.g. Advarra, WIRB, c.). (At least one of the following considerations should be true) The project is commercially sponsored research The institution's IRB lacks sufficient expertise to conduct the IRB review The institution is the lead site of a multi-site project and the IRB lacks sufficient resources to provide oversight of the project Other relevant considerations: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| evaluat | eneral Considerations for Ceding IRB Review to Other (Non-Commercial) IRBs. The following are additional considerations for ting the institution's willingness to cede IRB Review to an institution with a valid OHRP-approved Federalwide Assurance (FWA). (At least the following considerations should be true) |
| | |
| | Ceding IRB review is mandatory or optional. Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| | |
| | Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. The reviewing IRB has sufficient expertise and experience reviewing and overseeing research of similar nature to the proposed study. Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. The reviewing IRB has sufficient expertise with certain features of the protocol or the participant population that may pose special concerns. (e.g. recruitment of socially or economically disenfranchised populations, local cultural mores or unique clinical circumstances) Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| | Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. The reviewing IRB has sufficient expertise and experience reviewing and overseeing research of similar nature to the proposed study. Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. The reviewing IRB has sufficient expertise with certain features of the protocol or the participant population that may pose special concerns. (e.g. recruitment of socially or economically disenfranchised populations, local cultural mores or unique clinical circumstances) Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. Whether ceding IRB review could create or mitigate unique institutional risks, such as conflicts of interest Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. |
| | Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. The reviewing IRB has sufficient expertise and experience reviewing and overseeing research of similar nature to the proposed study. Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. The reviewing IRB has sufficient expertise with certain features of the protocol or the participant population that may pose special concerns. (e.g. recruitment of socially or economically disenfranchised populations, local cultural mores or unique clinical circumstances) Comments: Click or tap here to enter text. Whether ceding IRB review could create or mitigate unique institutional risks, such as conflicts of interest |