New Definitions, Categories, and Processes:

With the intent to modernize and strengthen its regulations, the government has issued revisions that resonate with the core aims of public health, and will better facilitate productive, scientific outcomes. These revisions include:

- The recognition and exclusion of public health surveillance activities, including the collection and testing of biospecimens, from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight.
- The requirement that a research study in which more than one institution located in the US is engaged be reviewed by a single IRB among those institutions with the others entering a relationship of reliance; and
- The expansion of exemption categories to include research involving the collection of identifiable human subjects data through survey and interview procedures.

In recognition of the value of genetic and molecular science to public health, the definition of public health activities extends to “the collection and testing of biospecimens, conducted, supported, requested, ordered, required, or authorized by a public health authority.” Such activities are limited to those necessary to allow a public health authority to identify, monitor, assess, or investigate potential public health signals, onset of disease outbreaks, or conditions of public health importance (including trends, signals, risk factors, patterns in diseases, or increases in injuries from using consumer products)” (82 Fed Reg 7,261 (2017)).

Balancing Risks and Benefits:

The revised Common Rule offers an opportunity to reflect on the risks associated with research involving cancer registry data and the adequacy of human subjects protections. The more than 15 million cancer survivors and persons living with cancer in the US have shifting social and cultural perceptions of cancer itself. Increasingly, physicians anticipate rendering some cancers curable and others more like chronic disease. Survivorship has become an attainable achievement and an everyday experience. As a result, some of the vulnerability associated with cancer research has been reduced.

Risks of informational harms, however, are more specifically defined in medical privacy laws, and identified by the use of information technologies in medicine and research. Through consent documents and other study materials, researchers describe the nature and potential impacts of loss of privacy and breach of confidentiality. Risks are informational harms, but are more specifically defined in medical privacy laws, and elevated due to the use of information technologies in medicine and research. Through consent documents and other study materials, researchers describe the nature and potential impacts of loss of privacy and breach of confidentiality. Risks are informational harms, but are more specifically defined in medical privacy laws, and elevated due to the use of information technologies in medicine and research.

Revised Regulations, Expanded Opportunities

Human Subjects Protection and Cancer Surveillance Research

Meaningful Oversight:

IRBs oversee risks that affect participant experience. IRBs may require researchers to signal risks such as recollection of trauma or distress, depression, or misperception of a disorder or other personal condition on the basis of research questions or inference from one’s own responses to research questions. Broadly, these risks may be characterized as risks of informational harms. The revised Common Rule indicates that when these risks are appropriately conveyed and mitigated through data management and security procedures, many research activities present minimal risk and may be efficiently approved or granted exemption.

The Cancer Registry of Greater California is a program of the Public Health Institute

For more information about cancer registry data and its use in research, or to request cancer data for your study, visit the Cancer Registry of Greater California.

http://crgc-cancer.org/data-access-and-disclosure/

Background: Because the work of cancer registries, illustrated in a schematic way above, is not fully realized until population-based cancer data are used to advance cancer science, improve public health, and reduce the cancer burden and scientific outcomes, the field of human subjects protection in research commands operational significance. The promulgation of new regulations embodied in revisions to the federal Common Rule presented an opportunity to ensure alignment between cancer registration and cancer registries’ support of the research and public health surveillance activities that depend on cancer registry data, especially data release services (represented at right).

The Cancer Registry of Greater California, in collaboration with partners at the Greater Bay Area Cancer Registry and the Cancer Surveillance Program of Los Angeles, undertook a review of the revised Common Rule to highlight key attributes and changes for the scientific community. The results are available through our open-access paper “Human Subjects Protection and Cancer Surveillance Research: Revised Regulations, Expanded Opportunities” (see below) and a poster (presented on left), and are incorporated into our data request policies and procedures.

The poster is available at:


The paper is available at:

http://cancersres.aacrjournals.org/content/77/12/3140.full

We encourage our colleagues and peers throughout the cancer registry community to make independent analyses and interpretations of the Common Rule, and to engage with human subjects protection in research as an essential means of crafting ethical science in pursuit of public health objectives, and the discovery and dissemination of knowledge.
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