Which of the following topics do you think are most pressing for this Working Group to directly address, based on research experience and personal interest? Please select a maximum of 3 options *Please note that IRB stands for Institutional Review Board*

1) Should we all adapt to central / national level IRB review as the primary stage review, followed by institutional approvals, will it be efficient?
   - 12 (20.7%)

2) Integrated ethics and regulatory approval, is it feasible?
   - 11 (19%)

3) Accelerated review: Which studies qualify for accelerated review? What should be the timeframe for accelerated review
   - 21 (36.2%)

4) Constitution of an Emergency response ethics panel: Do we need Emergency Response IRB panels, drawing on specialist members when new or niche expertise is required?
   - 28 (48.3%)

5) What are the resources necessary for making Review process adaptations under current circumstances (eg video conferencing)?
   - 19 (32.8%)

6) For those IRBs working in a paper-based world, are there any solutions or resources to enable efficient electronic systems? Strategies for accessible electronic IRB systems
   - 10 (17.2%)
1) Should we all adapt to central/national level IRB review as the primary stage review, followed by institutional approvals, will it be efficient?

2) Integrated ethics and regulatory approval, is it feasible?

3) Accelerated review: Which studies qualify for accelerated review? What should be the timeframe for accelerated review?

4) Constitution of an Emergency response ethics panel: Do we need Emergency Response IRB panels, drawing on specialist members when new or niche expertise is required?

5) What are the resources necessary for making Review process adaptations under current circumstances (e.g., video conferencing)?

6) For those IRBs working in a paper-based world, are there any solutions or resources to enable efficient electronic systems? Strategies for accessible electronic IRB systems

7) IRBs in LMICs where ethics and regulatory systems are not fully developed and lack national level comprehensive guidance; national level dialogue to identify the gaps and make recommendations for comprehensive guidance, (how experienced bodies support this)

8) IRB member training needs: understanding the standard of care for novel diseases and risk benefits assessment in the absence of sufficient safety and efficacy data remain difficult questions for IRB members.

Other | 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

1.a If you selected Other, please specify:

No responses

2 What type of studies should the workshop prioritise focus on for discussion related to research ethics processes? Please select as many as you feel relevant

- Clinical therapeutic trials | 53 (91.4%)
- Vaccine trials | 43 (74.1%)
- Disease surveillance / Epidemiological studies | 47 (81%)
- Health policy and research studies | 40 (69%)
- Observational / sampling only / non-intervention | 31 (53.4%)
- Post registration effectiveness / pharmacovigilance | 29 (50%)
- Social science / anthropology | 29 (50%)
- Other | 1 (1.7%)
2.a If you selected Other, please specify:

**Showing 1 response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies on new borns and pregnant women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In community programs, primitive tribal groups not exposed to other populations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>