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1 Vulnerable Subjects in Research

When participants in research conducted under the auspices of MaineHealth are likely to be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence or have diminished decision-making capacity, the research must include additional safeguards to protect the rights and welfare of these participants. The IRB must ensure that all of the regulatory requirements for the protection of subjects are met and that appropriate additional protections for vulnerable subjects are in place.

1.1 Definitions

Children. Children are persons who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted [45 CFR 46.402(a)].

According to Maine State Law, minors are persons under the age of eighteen. The general rule is that a person may sign legally-binding agreements and consent for his or her own medical care at the age of eighteen. Therefore, MaineHealth IRB defines children as persons who are under eighteen years of age. However, a minor may give consent to all medical, mental, dental and other counseling and services if the minor: 1) has been living separately from parents or legal guardians for at least 60 days and is independent of parental support; 2) Is or was legally married; 3) Is or was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; or (4) Has been emancipated by the court pursuant to 22 M.R.S.A §3506-A (22 M.R.S.A. §1503). Furthermore, Maine law also permits minors to seek care for drug addiction, sexually transmitted diseases, emotional disorders, or abortion without parental or guardian permission (Title 22 M.R.S.A. §1502). However, if hospitalization of greater than 16 hours is required for treatment, consent is required (Title 22 M.R.S.A §1823). Because Maine statutes do not specifically address consent for research, MaineHealth IRB will review issues of actual consent (as opposed to assent) related to the enrollment of minors (as defined under 22 M.R.S.A §1503) in research on a case-by-case basis.

NOTE: For research conducted in jurisdictions other than Maine, the research must comply with the laws regarding the legal age of consent in the relevant jurisdictions. Legal counsel will be consulted with regard to the laws in other jurisdictions or such “local context” information will be sought through other means (e.g., according to the terms of a reliance agreement).

Guardian. A guardian is an individual who is authorized under applicable state or local law to consent on behalf of a child to general medical care [45 CFR 46.402(e)].

In Maine, a “Guardian” of a minor (known as the guardian’s “ward”) means a person that has accepted a court or testamentary guardian appointment (18-A M.R.S.A. §5-201 and §5-203) and has the powers and responsibilities of a parent who has not been deprived of custody of a minor and unemancipated child, except that a guardian is not legally obligated to provide from the guardian’s own funds for the ward and is not liable to 3rd persons by reason of the parental relationship for act of the ward. The guardian is empowered to act in the minor’s best interests and may facilitate the ward’s education, social or other activities and give or withhold consents or approvals related to medical, health or other professional care, counsel, treatment or services for the ward. (18-A M.R.S.A. §5-209).
NOTE: For research conducted in jurisdictions other than Maine, the research must comply with the laws regarding guardianship in all relevant jurisdictions. Legal counsel will be consulted with regard to the laws in other jurisdictions or such “local context” information will be sought through other means (e.g., according to the terms of a reliance agreement).

**Fetus.** A fetus means the product of conception from implantation until delivery [45 CFR 46.202(c)].

**Dead fetus.** A fetus that exhibits neither heartbeat, spontaneous respiratory activity, spontaneous movement of voluntary muscles, nor pulsation of the umbilical cord [45 CFR 46.202(a)].

**Delivery.** Delivery means complete separation of the fetus from the woman by expulsion or extraction or any other means [45 CFR 46.202(b)].

**Neonate.** A neonate is a newborn [45 CFR 46.202(d)].

**Viable.** As it pertains to the neonate, viable means being able, after delivery, to survive (given the benefit of available medical therapy) to the point of independently maintaining heartbeat and respiration [45 CFR 46.202(h)]. If a neonate is viable, then, for the purposes of participation in research, the neonate is considered a child and the rules regarding participation of children in research apply.

**Nonviable neonate.** A nonviable neonate means a neonate after delivery that, although living, is not viable [45 CFR 46.202(e)].

**Pregnancy.** Pregnancy encompasses the period of time from implantation until delivery. A woman shall be assumed to be pregnant if she exhibits any of the pertinent presumptive signs of pregnancy, such as missed menses, until the results of a pregnancy test are negative or until delivery [45 CFR 46.202(f)].

**Prisoner.** Prisoner means any individual involuntarily confined or detained in a penal institution. The term is intended to encompass individuals sentenced to such an institution under a criminal or civil statute, individuals detained in other facilities by virtue of statutes or commitment procedures that provide alternatives to criminal prosecution or incarceration in a penal institution, and individuals detained pending arraignment, trial, or sentencing [45 CFR 303(c)].

### 1.2 Involvement of Vulnerable Populations in Research

When the IRB reviews research that involves categories of participants vulnerable to coercion or undue influence, the review process should include one or more individuals who are knowledgeable about or experienced in working with these participants. When the IRB does not have the relevant expertise among its membership, expertise may be sought through the use of consultants.

45 CFR 46 has additional subparts designed to provide extra protections for certain defined vulnerable populations which also have additional requirements for IRBs.

- **Subpart B** - Additional Protections for Pregnant Women, Human Fetuses and Neonates Involved in Research
- **Subpart C** - Additional Protections Pertaining to Biomedical and Behavioral Research Involving Prisoners as Subjects
- **Subpart D** - Additional Protections for Children Involved as Subjects in Research
DHHS-conducted or supported research that involves any of these populations must comply with the requirements of the relevant subparts. Research regulated by the FDA includes equivalent protections and obligations when research involves children (Subpart D). Research conducted, supported, or otherwise regulated by other federal agencies may or may not be covered by the subparts.

In its FWA, MaineHealth limits its commitment to apply Subparts B, C, and D to non-exempt human subjects research conducted or supported by DHHS or any other federal agency that requires compliance with the Subpart(s) (B, C, or D) applicable to the research.

1.3 Procedures

The following policies and procedures apply to all research involving vulnerable populations under the oversight of the MaineHealth IRB regardless of funding. Subsequent sections address additional procedures and requirements that apply to specific populations.

Initial Review of Research Proposal:

1. The investigator identifies the potential to enroll vulnerable subjects in the proposed research at initial review and provides the justification for their inclusion in the study;
2. The investigator describes safeguards to protect the subject’s rights and welfare in the research proposal;
3. IRB staff, in collaboration with the IRB Chair as needed, ensure that the IRB has the relevant expertise with the vulnerable population, and, if necessary, arrange for consultation. When the research involves no more than minimal risk and is eligible for expedited review, the designated reviewer may determine the need for additional expertise to ensure the protection of the vulnerable population(s);
4. The IRB evaluates the proposed safeguards, including, if applicable, the proposed plans for identifying, recruiting, and obtaining consent from subjects or their legally authorized representatives and the plans for assent of children and adults unable to provide consent;
5. When applicable, the IRB considers any costs associated with participation in the proposed research and any plans for reimbursement of expenses or provision of compensation, and the potential impact of such on the vulnerable population(s);
6. The IRB evaluates the research to determine whether the proposed plan is adequate or if additional protections are needed such as interim monitoring, review more than annually, or the use of a data and safety monitoring board, consent monitor, or research subject advocate.

Modifications to Research

1. When an investigator proposes to add inclusion of a vulnerable population after research has already been approved by the IRB, the investigator must submit a modification request to the IRB identifying the population they would like to add, justification for inclusion of the population, and any modifications to the research plan to ensure protection of the subjects’ rights and welfare;
2. The IRB staff and IRB will follow the procedures outlined for initial review above.

Continuing Review
1. At continuing review, the investigator should identify the number and categories of vulnerable subjects enrolled and any problems that arose relevant to their rights and welfare. When research does not include any interaction or intervention with subjects, and such information is not gathered, this should be noted on the continuing review report;

2. IRB staff, in collaboration with the IRB Chair as needed, ensure that the IRB has the relevant expertise with the vulnerable population, and, if necessary, arrange for consultation. When the research involves no more that minimal risk and is eligible for expedited review, the designated reviewer may determine the need for additional expertise to ensure the protection of the vulnerable population(s);

3. The IRB reviews the continuing review information, and any relevant information reported to the IRB during the period of approval, and determines whether the inclusion of vulnerable populations and the plans to protect the rights and welfare of vulnerable subjects remains appropriate.

1.4 Research Involving Pregnant Women, Human Fetuses and Neonates

The following applies to all research involving pregnant women, human fetuses, and neonates reviewed by the MaineHealth IRB. DHHS-specific requirements are noted in the appropriate sections.

If a woman becomes pregnant while participating in a study that has not been approved for inclusion of pregnant women, the IRB must be notified immediately so that the IRB can determine whether the subject may continue in the research, whether additional safeguards are needed, and to make the determinations required by the regulations and these policies.

1.4.1 Research Involving Pregnant Women or Fetuses

1.4.1.1 Research Not Conducted or Supported by DHHS

For research not conducted or supported by DHHS, where the risk to the pregnant women and fetus is no more than minimal, no additional safeguards are required by policy and there are no restrictions on the involvement of pregnant women in research. However, the IRB may determine that additional safeguards or restrictions are warranted for a specific study.

Pregnant women or fetuses may be involved in research not funded by DHHS involving more than minimal risk to pregnant women and/or fetuses if all of the following conditions are met:

1. Where scientifically appropriate, pre-clinical studies, including studies on pregnant animals, and clinical studies, including studies on non-pregnant women, have been conducted and provide data for assessing potential risks to pregnant women and fetuses;

2. The risk to the fetus is caused solely by interventions or procedures that hold out the prospect of direct benefit for the woman or the fetus;

3. Any risk is the least possible for achieving the objectives of the research;

4. If the research holds out the prospect of direct benefit to the pregnant woman, the prospect of a direct benefit both to the pregnant woman and the fetus, then the consent of the pregnant woman is obtained in accord with the provisions for informed consent;
5. If the research holds out the prospect of direct benefit solely to the fetus then the consent of the pregnant woman and the father is obtained in accord with the provisions for informed consent, except that the father's consent need not be obtained if he is unable to consent because of unavailability, incompetence, or temporary incapacity or the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest.

6. Each individual providing consent under paragraph 4 or 5 of this section is fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable impact of the research on the fetus or neonate;

7. For children (as defined in Section 16.1) who are pregnant, assent and permission are obtained in accord with the requirements of state law and the IRB;

8. No inducements, monetary or otherwise, will be offered to terminate a pregnancy;

9. Individuals engaged in the research will have no part in any decisions as to the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate a pregnancy; and

10. The IRB may allow individuals whose normal responsibilities include determining the viability of fetuses to be engaged in the research, if their involvement in the determination of viability for an individual fetus cannot be avoided. Confirmation of the determination regarding viability will be sought from a qualified individual who is not otherwise engaged in the research whenever possible prior to involving the subject(s) in the research. The opinion of the independent qualified individual will be documented and made available upon request to the IRB or HRPP representative. When advance confirmation is not possible, the investigator will obtain it as soon as s/he can after enrollment, but in all cases within 5 business days. The circumstances that prohibited prospective confirmation of viability and the outcome of the subsequent consultation will be reported to the IRB within 10 business days.

1.4.1.2 Research Conducted or Supported by DHHS

For DHHS-conducted or supported research, 45 CFR Subpart B applies to all non-exempt human subject research involving pregnant women, fetuses, and neonates.

Pregnant women or fetuses may be involved in research if all of the following conditions are met:

1. Where scientifically appropriate, pre-clinical studies, including studies on pregnant animals, and clinical studies, including studies on non-pregnant women, have been conducted and provide data for assessing potential risks to pregnant women and fetuses.

2. The risk to the fetus is caused solely by interventions or procedures that hold out the prospect of direct benefit for the woman or the fetus; or, if there is no such prospect of benefit, the risk to the fetus is not greater than minimal and the purpose of the research is the development of important biomedical knowledge which cannot be obtained by any other means;

3. Any risk is the least possible for achieving the objectives of the research;

4. If the research holds out the prospect of direct benefit to the pregnant woman, the prospect of a direct benefit both to the pregnant woman and the fetus, or no prospect of benefit for the woman nor the fetus when risk to the fetus is not greater than minimal and the purpose of the research is the development of important biomedical knowledge that cannot be obtained by any other means, then the consent of the pregnant woman is obtained in accord with the provisions for informed consent.
5. If the research holds out the prospect of direct benefit solely to the fetus then the consent of the pregnant woman and the father is obtained in accord with the provisions for informed consent, except that the father's consent need not be obtained if he is unable to consent because of unavailability, incompetence, or temporary incapacity or the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest.

6. Each individual providing consent under paragraph 4 or 5 of this section is fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable impact of the research on the fetus or neonate;

7. For children (as defined in Section 16.1) who are pregnant, assent and permission are obtained in accord with the provisions of permission and assent in Section 16.6.2;

8. No inducements, monetary or otherwise, will be offered to terminate a pregnancy;

9. Individuals engaged in the research will have no part in any decisions as to the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate a pregnancy; and

10. Individuals engaged in the research will have no part in determining the viability of a neonate.

1.4.2 Research involving Neonates of Uncertain Viability or Nonviable Neonates

1.4.2.1 Research Not Conducted or Supported by DHHS

Neonates of uncertain viability and nonviable neonates may be involved in research involving more than minimal risk if all of the conditions listed below are met. The IRB will determine on a case-by-case basis whether safeguards or restrictions should be required for minimal risk research.

1. Where scientifically appropriate, preclinical and clinical studies have been conducted and provide data for assessing potential risks to neonates.

2. Each individual providing consent is fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable impact of the research on the neonate.

3. The IRB may allow individuals whose normal responsibilities include determining the viability of neonates to be engaged in the research, if their involvement in the determination of viability for an individual neonate cannot be avoided. In such cases, confirmation of the determination regarding viability must be made by a qualified individual who is not otherwise engaged in the research whenever possible prior to involving the subject(s) in the research. The opinion of the independent qualified individual will be documented and made available upon request to the IRB or HRPP representative. When advance confirmation is not possible, the investigator will obtain it as soon as s/he can after enrollment, but in all cases within 5 business days. The circumstances that prohibited prospective confirmation of viability and the outcome of the subsequent consultation will be reported to the IRB within 10 business days.

4. The requirements of Neonates of Uncertain Viability or Nonviable Neonates (see below) have been met as applicable.

Neonates of Uncertain Viability. Until it has been ascertained whether a neonate is viable, a neonate may not be involved in research unless the following additional conditions have been met:

The IRB determines that:
1. The research holds out the prospect of enhancing the probability of survival of the neonate to the point of viability, and any risk is the least possible for achieving that objective, or

2. The purpose of the research is the development of important knowledge which cannot be obtained by other means and there will be no added risk to the neonate resulting from the research; and

3. The legally effective informed consent of either parent of the neonate or, if neither parent is able to consent because of unavailability, incompetence, or temporary incapacity, the legally effective informed consent of either parent’s LAR is obtained in accord with the provisions of permission and assent, except that the consent of the father or his LAR need not be obtained if the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest.

Nonviable Neonates. After delivery, nonviable neonates may not be involved in research unless all of the following additional conditions are met:

1. Vital functions of the neonate will not be artificially maintained;
2. The research will not terminate the heartbeat or respiration of the neonate;
3. There will be no added risk to the neonate resulting from the research;
4. The purpose of the research is the development of important knowledge that cannot be obtained by other means; and
5. The legally effective informed consent of both parents of the neonate is obtained in accord with the provisions of permission and assent, except that the waiver and alteration of the provisions of permission and assent do not apply.

However, if either parent is unable to consent because of unavailability, incompetence, or temporary incapacity, the informed consent of one parent of a nonviable neonate will suffice to meet the requirements of this paragraph, except that the consent of the father need not be obtained if the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest. The consent of a LAR of either or both of the parents of a nonviable neonate will not suffice.

1.4.2.2 Research Conducted or Supported by DHHS

Neonates of uncertain viability and nonviable neonates may be involved in research conducted or supported by DHHS if all of the following conditions are met:

1. Where scientifically appropriate, preclinical and clinical studies have been conducted and provide data for assessing potential risks to neonates.
2. Each individual providing consent is fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable impact of the research on the neonate.
3. Individuals engaged in the research will have no part in determining the viability of a neonate.
4. The requirements of Neonates of Uncertain Viability or Nonviable Neonates (see below) have been met as applicable.

Neonates of Uncertain Viability. Until it has been ascertained whether a neonate is viable, a neonate may not be involved in research unless the following additional conditions have been met:
The research holds out the prospect of enhancing the probability of survival of the neonate to the point of viability, and any risk is the least possible for achieving that objective, or

1. The purpose of the research is the development of important biomedical knowledge which cannot be obtained by other means and there will be no added risk to the neonate resulting from the research; and

2. The legally effective informed consent of either parent of the neonate or, if neither parent is able to consent because of unavailability, incompetence, or temporary incapacity, the legally effective informed consent of either parent's LAR is obtained in accord with the provisions of permission and assent, except that the consent of the father or his LAR need not be obtained if the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest.

**Nonviable Neonates.** After delivery, nonviable neonates may not be involved in research unless all of the following additional conditions are met:

1. Vital functions of the neonate will not be artificially maintained;
2. The research will not terminate the heartbeat or respiration of the neonate;
3. There will be no added risk to the neonate resulting from the research;
4. The purpose of the research is the development of important biomedical knowledge that cannot be obtained by other means; and
5. The legally effective informed consent of both parents of the neonate is obtained in accord with the provisions of permission and assent, except that the waiver and alteration of the provisions of permission and assent do not apply.

However, if either parent is unable to consent because of unavailability or incapacity, the informed consent of one parent of a nonviable neonate will suffice to meet the requirements of this paragraph, except that the consent of the father need not be obtained if the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest. The consent of a LAR of either or both of the parents of a nonviable neonate will not suffice.

**1.4.3 Viable Neonates**

A neonate, after delivery, that has been determined to be viable may be included in research only to the extent permitted by and in accord with the requirements for research involving children (i.e., a viable neonate is a child for purposes of applying federal research regulations and MaineHealth policies).

**1.4.4 Research Involving, After Delivery, the Placenta, the Dead Fetus or Fetal Material**

Research involving, after delivery, the placenta; the dead fetus; macerated fetal material; or cells, tissue, or organs excised from a dead fetus, must be conducted only in accord with any applicable federal, state, or local laws and regulations regarding such activities.

If information associated with material described above in this section is recorded for research purposes in a manner that living individuals can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to those individuals, those individuals are research subjects and all pertinent sections of these policies and procedures are applicable.
1.4.5 Research Not Otherwise Approvable

1.4.5.1 Research Not Conducted or Supported by DHHS

If the IRB finds that the research presents a reasonable opportunity to further the understanding, prevention, or alleviation of a serious problem affecting the health or welfare of pregnant women, fetuses or neonates; and the research is not approvable under the provisions described previously in this section, the IRB will consult with a panel of experts in pertinent disciplines (for example: science, medicine, ethics, law). Based on the recommendation of the panel, the IRB may approve the research based on either:

1. That the research in fact satisfies the conditions detailed above, as applicable; or
2. The following:
   a. The research presents a reasonable opportunity to further the understanding, prevention, or alleviation of a serious problem affecting the health or welfare of pregnant women, fetuses or neonates;
   b. The research will be conducted in accord with sound ethical principles; and
   c. Informed consent will be obtained in accord with the requirements for informed consent described in this manual.

1.4.5.2 Research Conducted or Supported by DHHS

DHHS-conducted or supported research that falls in this category must be approved by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. If the IRB finds that the research presents a reasonable opportunity to further the understanding, prevention, or alleviation of a serious problem affecting the health or welfare of pregnant women, fetuses or neonates; and the research is not approvable under the above provisions, then the research will be sent to OHRP for DHHS review.

1.5 Research Involving Prisoners

1.5.1 Applicability

While MaineHealth does not plan to engage in research involving prisoners, these procedures would be followed in the event a subject became a prisoner.

For research not conducted or supported by DHHS, where the risk to prisoners is no more than minimal (as defined in Section 16.5.2), no additional safeguards are required under these policies and procedures. However, the IRB may determine that additional safeguards or restrictions are warranted for a specific study.

For research involving more than minimal risk, and for research conducted or supported by DHHS, the requirements outlined in this section apply.

As applicable, investigators must obtain permission from and abide by the requirements of correctional authorities and state or local law.
1.5.2 Minimal Risk

Minimal risk, in studies involving prisoners, means the probability and magnitude of physical or psychological harm that is normally encountered in the daily lives, or in the routine medical, dental, or psychological examination of healthy persons.

1.5.3 Composition of the IRB

In addition to satisfying the general membership requirements detailed in other sections of these policies and procedures, when reviewing research involving prisoners, the IRB must also meet the following requirements:

1. A majority of the IRB (exclusive of prisoner members) must have no association with the prison(s) involved, apart from their membership on the IRB;
2. At least one member of the IRB must be a prisoner, or a prisoner representative with appropriate background and experience to serve in that capacity, except that where a particular research project is reviewed by more than one IRB, only one IRB need satisfy this requirement; and
3. The prisoner representative must be a voting member of the IRB. A comment may be added to the roster indicating that the prisoner representative will only count towards quorum when s/he is in attendance and reviewing studies involving prisoners.

1.5.4 Review of Research Involving Prisoners

Initial Review of Research Proposal

1. The prisoner representative must review research involving prisoners, focusing on the requirements outlined in Subpart C and these policies;
2. The prisoner representative must receive all review materials pertaining to the research (same as primary reviewer); and
3. The prisoner representative must be present at a convened meeting when the research involving prisoners is reviewed. If the prisoner representative is not present, research involving prisoners cannot be reviewed or approved. The prisoner representative may attend the meeting by phone, video-conference, or webinar, so long as the representative is able to participate in the meeting as if they were present in person at the meeting.
4. The IRB must be familiar with the specific conditions in the local prison(s) or jail site(s) that are pertinent to subject protections, before approving the proposal for the local site (45 CFR 46.107(a)).

Modifications to Research

1. Minor modifications to research involving prisoners may be reviewed using the expedited procedure described below;
2. Modifications reviewed by the convened IRB must use the same procedures for initial review including the responsibility of the prisoner representative to review the modification and participate in the meeting (as described above).
Continuing Review

1. Continuing review will follow the same procedures as initial review including the responsibility of the prisoner representative to review the continuing review materials and participate in the meeting (as described above).

Expedited Review

1. Research involving interaction with prisoners may be reviewed by the expedited procedure if a determination is made that the research involves no greater than minimal risk for the prison population being studied and the research falls within the categories of research eligible for expedited review. Whenever possible, the prisoner representative will be consulted to verify that they agree that the research is minimal risk and to conduct (if designated by the IRB Chair as an expedited reviewer) or participate in the expedited review as a consultant. Review of modifications and continuing review will follow these same procedures;

2. Research that does not involve interaction with prisoners (e.g., records review) may be reviewed by the expedited procedure if a determination is made that the research involves no greater than minimal risk for the prison population being studied. Review by a prisoner representative is not required. The prisoner representative may review the research as a reviewer (if designated by the IRB Chair as an expedited reviewer) or consultant. Review of modifications and continuing review will follow these same procedures.

1.5.5 Incarceration of Enrolled Subjects

1. If a subject becomes a prisoner while enrolled in a research study that was not reviewed according to these procedures, the investigator must promptly notify the IRB and the IRB shall:

   a. Confirm that the subject meets the definition of a prisoner;

   b. Consult with the investigator to determine if it is in the best interests of the subject to continue participation in the study, in part or in full, and if so, if there are specific study activities which are in the best interests of the subject that should continue until the IRB is able to review the research applying the standards and requirements for research involving prisoners.

2. If the subject should continue, one of two options are available:

   a. Keep the subject enrolled in the study and review the research applying the standards and requirements for research involving prisoners. If some of the requirements cannot be met or are not applicable (e.g., procedures for the selection of subjects within the prison), but it is in the best interests of the subject to remain in the study, keep the subject enrolled and, if the research is DHHS-conducted or supported, inform OHRP of the decision along with the justification; or

   b. Remove the subject from the study and keep the subject on the study intervention under an alternate mechanism such as compassionate use or off-label use.

3. If a subject is incarcerated temporarily while enrolled in a study:
a. If the temporary incarceration has no effect on the study (i.e., there is no need for study activities involving the prisoner subject to take place during the temporary incarceration), keep the subject enrolled.

b. If the temporary incarceration has an effect on the study, follow the guidance outlined above.

4. If a subject becomes incarcerated while enrolled in a study, the IRB may determine that follow up data may be collected for the incarcerated participant.

1.5.6 Additional Duties of the IRB

In addition to the responsibilities of the IRB described in other sections of this manual, the IRB will review research involving prisoners and approve such research only if it finds that:

1. The research falls into one of the following permitted categories [45 CFR 46.306(a)(2)]:
   a. Study of the possible causes, effects, and processes of incarceration, and of criminal behavior, provided that the study presents no more than minimal risk and no more than inconvenience to the subjects;
   b. Study of prisons as institutional structures or of prisoners as incarcerated persons, provided that the study presents no more than minimal risk and no more than inconvenience to the subjects;
   c. Research on conditions particularly affecting prisoners as a class (for example, research on diseases or social and psychological problems much more prevalent in prisons) provided that the study may proceed only after the DHHS Secretary has consulted with appropriate experts in penology, medicine, and ethics, and published notice in the Federal Register of his/her intent to approve the research;
   d. Research on practices, both innovative and accepted, which have the intent and reasonable probability of improving the health or well-being of the subject. In cases in which those studies require the assignment of prisoners in a manner consistent with protocols/research plans approved by the IRB to control groups which may not benefit from the research, the study may proceed only after the DHHS Secretary has consulted with appropriate experts in penology, medicine, and ethics, and published notice in the Federal Register of his/her intent to approve the research; or
   e. The research qualifies under the HHS Secretarial waiver that applies to certain epidemiological research (68 FR 36929, June 20, 2003). The criteria for this category are that the research must have as its sole purpose (i) to describe the prevalence or incidence of a disease by identifying all cases, or (ii) to study potential risk factor associations for a disease.

2. Any possible advantages accruing to the prisoner through his or her participation in the research, when compared to the general living conditions, medical care, quality of food, amenities and opportunity for earnings in the prison, are not of such a magnitude that his or her ability to weigh the risks of the research against the value of such advantages in the limited choice environment of the prison is impaired;
3. The risks involved in the research are commensurate with risks that would be accepted by non-prisoner volunteers;

4. Procedures for the selection of subjects within the prison are fair to all prisoners and immune from arbitrary intervention by prison authorities or prisoners. Unless the investigator provides to the IRB justification in writing for following some other procedures, control subjects must be selected randomly from the group of available prisoners who meet the characteristics needed for that particular research proposal;

5. The information is presented in language which is understandable to the subject population;

6. Adequate assurance exists that parole boards will not take into account a prisoner's participation in the research in making decisions regarding parole, and each prisoner is clearly informed in advance that participation in the research will have no effect on his or her parole; and

7. Where the IRB finds there may be a need for follow-up examination or care of subjects after the end of their participation, adequate provision has been made for such examination or care, taking into account the varying lengths of individual prisoners' sentences, and for informing subjects of this fact.

1.5.7 Certification to DHHS

Under 45 CFR 46.305(c), the institution responsible for conducting research involving prisoners that is conducted or supported by DHHS shall certify to the Secretary (through OHRP) that the IRB has made the seven findings required under 45 CFR 46.305(a) and receive OHRP authorization prior to initiating any research involving prisoners. Certifications, and requests for DHHS Secretarial consultation, do not need to be submitted to OHRP for research not conducted or supported by DHHS, regardless of whether the institution has chosen to extend the applicability of its FWA and Subparts B, C, and D to all research.

For all DHHS-conducted or supported research, MaineHealth will send to OHRP a certification letter to this effect, which will also include the name and address of the institution and specifically identify the research study in question and any relevant DHHS grant application or protocol/research plan. DHHS-conducted or supported research involving prisoners as subjects may not proceed until OHRP issues its authorization in writing to MaineHealth on behalf of the Secretary.

Under its authority at 45 CFR 46.115(b), OHRP requires that the institution responsible for the conduct of the proposed research also submit to OHRP a copy of the research proposal so that OHRP can determine whether the proposed research involves one of the categories of research permissible under 45 CFR 46.306(a)(2), and if so, which one.

The term “research proposal” includes:

1. The IRB-approved protocol; any relevant DHHS grant application or proposal;

2. Any IRB application forms required by the IRB; and

3. Any other information requested or required by the IRB to be considered during initial IRB review.

OHRP also encourages the organization to include the following information in its prisoner research certification letter to facilitate processing:
1. The OHRP Federalwide Assurance (FWA) number;
2. The IRB registration number for the designated IRB; and
3. The date(s) of IRB meeting(s) in which the study was considered, including a brief chronology that encompasses:
   a. The date of initial IRB review; and
   b. The date of subpart C review, if not done at the time of initial IRB review.

1.6 Research Involving Children

The following applies to research involving children, (with the exception of MaineHealth Flex Categories for non-federally funded research—see Section 12.1.2 for allowable expedited categories). The requirements in this section are consistent with Subpart D of 45 CFR 46, which applies to DHHS-funded research and Subpart D of 21 CFR 50, which applies to FDA-regulated research involving children.

1.6.1 Allowable Categories

In addition to the IRB’s normal duties, research involving children must be reviewed by the IRB to determine if it fits within and is permissible under one or more federally-defined categories (OHRP/FDA). Each procedure or intervention that the child will undergo for the research must be taken into consideration, and, if the research includes more than one study group assignment (e.g., placebo vs. active, investigational agent vs. comparator) the category determination must be made for each group assignment. In other words, a component analysis must be conducted by the IRB. The categories are as follows:

1. Research/Clinical Investigations not involving greater than minimal risk [45 CFR 46.404/21 CFR 50.51]. Research determined to not involve greater than minimal risk to child subjects may be approved by the IRB only if the IRB finds and documents that adequate provisions are made for soliciting the assent of the children and the permission of their parents or guardians as set forth in Section 16.6.2.

2. Research/Clinical Investigations involving greater than minimal risk but presenting the prospect of direct benefit to the individual subjects [45 CFR 46.405/21 CFR 50.52]. Research in which the IRB finds that more than minimal risk to children is presented by an intervention or procedure that holds out the prospect of direct benefit for the individual subject, or by a monitoring procedure that is likely to contribute to the subject’s well-being, may be approved by the IRB only if the IRB finds and documents that:
   a. The risk is justified by the anticipated benefit to the subjects;
   b. The relation of the anticipated benefit to the risk is at least as favorable to the subjects as that presented by available alternative options; and
   c. Adequate provisions are made for soliciting the assent of children and the permission of their parents or guardians as set forth in Section 16.6.2.

3. Research/Clinical Investigations involving greater than minimal risk and no prospect of direct benefit to the individual subject, but likely to yield generalizable knowledge about the subject’s disorder or
condition [45 CFR 46.406/21 CFR 50.53]. Research in which the IRB finds that more than minimal risk to children is presented by an intervention or procedure that does not hold out the prospect of direct benefit for the individual subject, or by a monitoring procedure which is not likely to contribute to the well-being of the subject, may be approved by the IRB only if the IRB finds and documents that:

a. The risk represents a minor increase over minimal risk;

b. The intervention or procedure presents experiences to subjects that are reasonably commensurate with those inherent in their actual or expected medical, dental, psychological, social, or educational situations;

c. The intervention or procedure is likely to yield generalizable knowledge about the subjects’ disorder or condition which is of vital importance for the understanding or amelioration of the subjects’ disorder or condition; and

d. Adequate provisions are made for soliciting the assent of children and the permission of their parents or guardians as set forth in Section 16.6.2.

4. Research not otherwise approvable which presents an opportunity to understand, prevent, or alleviate serious problems affecting the health or welfare of children [45 CFR 46.407/21 CFR 50.54]. When the IRB does not believe that the research meets the requirements of any of the above categories, and the IRB finds and documents that the research presents a reasonable opportunity to further the understanding, prevention, or alleviation of a serious problem affecting the health or welfare of children, the IRB shall refer the research for further review as follows:

a. DHHS-conducted or supported research in this category will be referred for review by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. However, before doing so the IRB must determine that the proposed research also meets all of the requirements of the Common Rule.

b. FDA-regulated research in this category will be referred for review by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

c. For research that is not DHHS conducted or supported and not FDA-regulated, the IRB will consult with a panel of experts in pertinent disciplines (for example: science, medicine, ethics, law). Based on the recommendation of the panel, the IRB may approve the research based on either:

i. That the research in fact satisfies the conditions of the previous categories, as applicable; or

ii. The following:

1. The research presents a reasonable opportunity to further the understanding, prevention, or alleviation of a serious problem affecting the health or welfare of children;

2. The research will be conducted in accord with sound ethical principles; and

3. Adequate provisions are made for soliciting the assent of children and the permission of their parents or guardians as set forth in Section 16.6.2.
1.6.2 Parental Permission and Assent

1.6.2.1 Parental Permission

The IRB must determine that adequate provisions have been made for soliciting the permission of each child’s parent or guardian.

Parents or guardians must be provided with the basic elements of consent and any additional elements the IRB deems necessary, as described in Section 15.

The IRB may find that the permission of one parent is sufficient for research to be conducted under Categories 1 [45 CFR 46.404/21 CFR 50.51] & 2 [45 CFR 46.405/21 CFR 50.52] above. The IRB’s determination of whether permission must be obtained from one or both parents will be documented in the reviewer’s notes when a study receives expedited review, and in meeting minutes when reviewed by the convened committee.

Permission from both parents is required for research to be conducted under Categories 3 [45 CFR 46.406/21 CFR 50.53] & 4 [45 CFR 46.407/21 CFR 50.54] above unless:

1. One parent is deceased, unknown, incompetent, or not reasonably available; or
2. When only one parent has legal responsibility for the care and custody of the child.

The IRB may waive the requirement for obtaining permission from a parent or legal guardian if:

1. The research meets the provisions for waiver in Section 15.10; or
2. For research that is not FDA-regulated, if the IRB determines that the research is designed to study conditions in children or a subject population for which parental or guardian permission is not a reasonable requirement to protect the subjects (for example, neglected or abused children) provided that an appropriate mechanism for protecting the children who will participate as subjects in the research is substituted, and that the waiver is not inconsistent with Federal, State, or local law. The choice of an appropriate mechanism would depend upon the nature and purpose of the activities described in the protocol/research plan, the risk and anticipated benefit to the research subjects, and the child’s age, maturity, status, and condition.

Permission from parents or legal guardians must be documented in accordance with and to the extent required by Section 15.7.

1.6.2.2 Assent from Children

The IRB is responsible for determining that adequate provisions are made for soliciting the assent of the children, when in the judgment of the IRB the children are capable of providing assent. This judgment may be made for all children to be involved in the study, or for each child, as the IRB deems appropriate.

If the IRB determines that the capability of some or all of the children is so limited that they cannot reasonably be consulted or that the intervention or procedure involved in the research holds out a prospect of direct benefit that is important to the health or well-being of the children and is available only in the context of the research, the assent of the children is not a necessary condition for proceeding with the research. Even where the IRB determines that the subjects are capable of assenting, the IRB may still waive the assent requirement under circumstances in which consent may be waived in accordance with the applicable regulations. It is
important to note that the FDA regulations do permit the IRB to waive the assent requirement if it finds and documents that:

1. The clinical investigation involves no more than minimal risk to the subjects;
2. The waiver will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects;
3. The clinical investigation could not practicably be carried out without the waiver; and
4. Whenever appropriate, the subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.

Because “assent” means a child’s affirmative agreement to participate in research, the child must actively show his or her willingness to participate in the research, rather than just complying with directions to participate and not resisting in any way.

The IRB should take into account the nature of the proposed research activity and the ages, maturity, and psychological state of the children involved when reviewing the proposed assent procedure and the form and content of the information conveyed to the prospective subjects. For research activities involving adolescents whose capacity to understand resembles that of adults, the assent procedure should likewise include information similar to what would be provided for informed consent by adults or for parental permission. For children whose age and maturity level limits their ability to fully comprehend the nature of the research activity, but who are still capable of being consulted about participation in research, it may be appropriate to focus on conveying an accurate picture of what the actual experience of participation in research is likely to be (for example, what the experience will be, how long it will take, whether it might involve any pain or discomfort). The assent procedure should reflect a reasonable effort to enable the child to understand, to the degree they are capable, what their participation in research would involve.

Parents and children will not always agree on whether the child should participate in research. Where the IRB has indicated that the assent of the child is required in order for him or her to be enrolled in the study, dissent from the child overrides permission from a parent. Similarly, a child typically cannot decide to be in research over the objections of a parent. There are individual exceptions to these guidelines but in general, children should not be forced to be research subjects, even when permission has been given by their parents.

Documentation of Assent

When the IRB determines that assent is required, it is also responsible for determining whether and how assent must be documented.

To document assent, some IRBs require the use of an assent form while some do not. The MaineHealth IRB prefers that the investigator document each child's assent on the permission form signed by their parent(s); the IRB prefers that investigators not use a separate form. The abilities and needs of children vary widely and investigators should provide the information in a format tailored to the child in front of them. In many cases, assent forms are simplified consent forms that include elements that are irrelevant to assent (e.g. risk assessment, confidentiality) and are rarely written with sufficient simplicity of style and readability to achieve their intended objective.

The MaineHealth IRB does not require children to sign their name to document their assent. On the MaineHealth template consent/permission form signature pages, the signature of the child is left optional.
MaineHealth’s preference is for investigators to focus on the assent process rather than on obtaining a signature for a form. The child’s decision regarding whether or not to assent to participation in the research should be documented in the child’s research record by the person obtaining assent.

The MaineHealth IRB may determine that the assent process be witnessed by an individual not affiliated with the study team or child’s family. The witness may sign the consent form attesting to the assent of the child.

### 1.6.2.3 Children who are Wards

Children who are wards of the State or any other agency, institution, or entity can be included in research approved under 45 CFR 46.406/21 CFR 50.53 or 45 CFR 46.407/21 CFR 50.54 (Categories 3 & 4 in Section 16.6.1), **only if such research** is:

1. Related to their status as wards; or
2. Conducted in schools, camps, hospitals, institutions, or similar settings in which the majority of children involved as subjects are not wards.

If the research meets the condition(s) above, an advocate must be appointed for each child who is a ward (one individual may serve as advocate for more than one child), in addition to any other individual acting on behalf of the child as legal guardian or in loco parentis.

The advocate must be an individual who has the background and experience to act in, and agrees to act in, the best interests of the child for the duration of the child’s participation in the research and who is not associated in any way (except in the role as advocate or member of the IRB) with the research, the investigator(s), or the guardian organization.

### 1.7 Adults with Impaired Decision-Making Capacity

When vulnerable populations are included in research, regulations require that additional safeguards are put in place to protect the rights and welfare of these subjects. Adults who lack or who have impaired, fluctuating, or diminishing decision-making capacity (collectively referred to as “adults with impaired decision-making capacity” in this section) are particularly vulnerable. Investigators and IRBs must carefully consider whether inclusion of such subjects in a research study is appropriate; and when it is, must consider how best to ensure that these subjects are adequately protected. The principals and procedures outlined in this section are intended to assist MaineHealth investigators and the IRB with the development and review of research involving adults with impaired decision-making capacity.

#### 1.7.1 Informed Consent

Obtaining legally effective informed consent before involving human subjects in research is one of the central ethical principles described in the Belmont Report and provided for by federal regulations governing research.

As discussed previously, the informed consent process involves three key features: (1) providing the prospective subject the information needed to make an informed decision (in language understandable to him or her); (2) facilitating the understanding of what has been disclosed; and (3) promoting the voluntariness of the decision about whether to participate in the research.
Among other requirements, for consent to be legally effective, the potential subject or their LAR must have the necessary decision-making capacity to make a rational and meaningful choice about whether to participate (or continue participating) in a study.

### 1.7.2 Decision-Making Capacity

“Decision-making capacity” refers to a potential subject’s ability to make a rational and meaningful decision about whether or not to participate in a research study. This ability is generally thought to include at least the following four elements:

1. **Understanding**, i.e., the ability to comprehend the disclosed information about the nature and purpose of the study, the procedures involved, the risks and benefits of participating versus not participating, and the voluntary nature of participating;
2. **Appreciation**, i.e., the ability to appreciate the significance of the disclosed information and the potential risks and benefits for one’s own situation and condition;
3. **Reasoning**, i.e., the ability to engage in a reasoning process about the risks and benefits of participating versus alternatives, and;
4. **Choice**, i.e., the ability to express a choice about whether or not to participate.

“Decision-making capacity” should not be confused with the legal concept of “competence.” While the court may consider information about a person’s decision-making capacity in making a competency determination, the terms are not synonymous. Incompetence is a legal determination made by a court of law. For example, someone who is judged legally incompetent to manage their financial affairs may retain sufficient decision-making capacity to make meaningful decisions about participating in a research protocol. Likewise, people who have normal cognitive functioning and are considered legally competent may be put into circumstances where their decision-making capacity is temporarily impaired by a physical or mental condition or by alcohol or drugs.

Decision-making capacity is protocol and situation-specific. Thus, a person may have capacity to consent to participate in low risk research in usual circumstances, but not have the capacity to consent to a higher risk protocol when s/he is under significant stress or faced with unfamiliar circumstances.

### 1.7.3 Inclusion of Adults with Impaired Decision-Making Capacity in Research

Research involving adult subjects without the ability to provide consent or with impaired decision-making capacity should only be conducted when the aims of the research cannot reasonably be achieved without their participation.

Investigators must disclose to the IRB both plans and justification for including adults with impaired decision-making capacity in a given research proposal. If adults with questionable or fluctuating capacity will be included, investigators must specify procedures for assessing capacity prior to providing informed consent and, if appropriate, for re-evaluating capacity during study participation. If a prospective subject’s capacity to consent is expected to diminish, the investigator should consider requesting that the subject designate a future LAR prior to enrollment in the research, including the future LAR in the initial consent process, and obtaining written documentation of the subject’s wishes regarding participation in the research.
study includes subjects likely to regain capacity to consent while the research is ongoing, the investigator should include provisions to inform them of their participation and seek consent for ongoing participation.

Plans for evaluation of capacity should be tailored to the subject population and the risks and nature of the research. In some instances, assessment by a qualified investigator may be appropriate. However, an independent, qualified assessor should evaluate subjects’ capacity when the risks of the research are more than a minor increase over minimal or the investigator is in a position of authority over a prospective subject. The person(s) evaluating capacity must be qualified to do so and may use appropriate tools and. Assessments of capacity should be documented in the research record, and when appropriate, in the medical record.

Under some circumstances, it may be possible for investigators to enable adults with a degree of decisional impairment to make voluntary and informed decisions to consent, assent, or refuse participation in research. Potential measures include repetitive teaching, audiovisual presentations, and oral or written recall tests. Other measures might include follow-up questions to assess subject understanding, videotaping or audio-taping of consent discussions, use of waiting periods to allow more time for the potential subject to consider the information that has been presented, or involvement of a trusted family member or friend in the disclosure and decision-making process. Audio or videotapes, electronic presentations, or written materials used to promote understanding must be provided to the IRB for review and approval prior to use.

When a prospective subject is deemed to lack capacity to consent to participate in research, investigators may obtain informed consent from the individuals’ surrogate or LAR (See Section 15.3). Under these circumstances, the prospective subject should still be informed about the research in a manner compatible with the subjects’ likely understanding and, if possible, be asked to assent to participate. Potential subjects who express resistance or dissent (by word, gesture, or action) to either participation or use of surrogate consent, should be excluded from the study. Some subjects may initially assent but later resist participation. Under no circumstances may an investigator or caregiver override a subject’s dissent or resistance. When assent is possible for some or all subjects, the investigator should provide the IRB with an assent plan that describes when and how assent will be obtained, provisions that will be taken to promote understanding and voluntariness, how assent will be documented, and a copy of the assent form (as applicable). If the investigator intends to use audio or video recordings to document assent, provisions to ensure the security of the recordings should be described to the IRB.

When inclusion of adults with impaired decision-making capacity is not anticipated and a plan for inclusion of such subjects has not been reviewed and approved by the IRB, and an enrolled subject becomes unable to provide consent or impaired in decision-making capacity, the investigator is responsible for promptly notifying the IRB (as soon as possible but within 5 business days). The investigator should consider whether continuing participation is appropriate and, if so, present a plan for surrogate consent from a LAR and, if appropriate, a plan to periodically evaluate capacity and re-obtain consent if possible.

1.7.4 IRB Review

The IRB review process will include at least one member, or a consultant, who is experienced with or otherwise knowledgeable about the population when the research involves greater than minimal risk, or the research is minimal risk but includes interactions with subjects, and the proposed subject population includes adults with impaired decision-making capacity.
In evaluating research, the IRB must be able to determine that the risks to subjects are reasonable not only in relation to any benefits, but also in relation to the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result. In considering the risks of research involving adults with impaired decision-making capacity, the IRB should consider whether any components of the research involve risks that are greater for participants with diminished capacity. For example, whether subjects might experience increased sensitivity or discomfort to certain stimuli or may not be able to verbalize or otherwise demonstrate when they are experiencing discomfort or pain.

As appropriate to the research, the IRB should consider the following in evaluating research involving adults with impaired decision-making capacity:

1. Whether the aims of the research cannot reasonably be achieved without inclusion of the population;
2. Whether the research is likely to improve the understanding of the condition, disease, or issue affecting the subject population;
3. Whether any experimental procedure or interventions have undergone pre-clinical testing or human testing on other populations and whether the data from that testing supports its use in the proposed research;
4. Whether the procedures or interventions that the subject will undergo in the research place them at increased risk and whether appropriate mechanisms are in place to minimize risks, when possible;
5. Whether the data and safety monitoring plan, including any stopping rules, is appropriate given the risks of the research and the vulnerability of the population;
6. Whether the procedures for withdrawing individual subjects from the research are appropriate;
7. Whether the recruitment procedures, consent process, and any plans for financial compensation support voluntariness and minimize the likelihood of undue influence or coercion;
8. Whether the subjects will be exposed to financial or other risks that they might not consider acceptable if they had the capacity to provide consent, and whether appropriate mechanisms have been put into place to minimize these risks;
9. Whether the procedures for determining capacity to provide consent, and for evaluating capacity on an ongoing basis, if applicable, are appropriate;
10. Whether the procedures for informing subjects who regain capacity about their involvement in the research, and for obtaining consent for on-going participation, if applicable, are appropriate;
11. Whether assent should be required when possible, and, if so, if the proposed procedures to obtain and document assent are appropriate;
12. Whether periodic re-evaluation of capacity and/or periodic re-consent should be required; and
13. Whether a research subject advocate or consent monitor should be required, for some or all subjects.

In general, the IRB will only approve research involving subjects unable to provide consent or with impaired decision-making capacity when the aims of the research cannot reasonably be achieved without inclusion of the population, and there are appropriate provisions to: (1) evaluate capacity, (2) obtain consent (and assent if possible), and (3) otherwise protect subjects.