|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee:** | Central Health and Disability Ethics Committee |
| **Meeting date:** | 25 January 2022 |
| **Zoom details:** | <https://mohnz.zoom.us/j/96507589841> |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Review Reference** | **Project Title** | **Coordinating Investigator** | **Lead Reviewers** |
| 12.00-12.30pm | 2021 EXP 11590 | Real World Data Collection Among Pediatric Neuroblastoma Patients Treated with Lorlatinib Through Expanded Access Program | Dr Andrew Wood | Dr Cordelia Thomas & Dr Peter Gallagher |
| 12.30-1.00pm | 2021 EXP 11484 | Genetic markers in Ovarian Cancer in New Zealand - NOVel | Dr Bryony Simcock | Mrs Helen Walker & Ms Albany Lucas |
| 1.00-1.30pm | 2021 FULL 11498 | Rapid Avastin Treat and Extend Trial | Dr Vidit Singh | Ms Sandy Gill & Ms Julie Jones |
| 1.30-2.00pm | 2021 FULL 11798 | Tramadol-adrenaline vs lignocaine-adrenaline: a randomised, double-blinded, split-mouth, clinical cross-over trial comparing post-op pain and OHRQoL following mandibular 3rd molar surgery. | Dr Robert Mane | Mrs Helen Walker & Dr Patries Herst |
|  |  | *Break* |  |  |
| 2.10-2.40pm | 2021 FULL 11864 | Testing new brain stimulation technique for improving memory and function. | Professor Dirk De Ridder | Dr Cordelia Thomas & Dr Peter Gallagher |
| 2.40-3.10pm | 2021 EXP 11116 | Reboot Kids – A randomised controlled trial of a behavioural medicine intervention to prevent obesity and metabolic complications in young cancer survivors recently treatment (New Zealand pilot). | Dr Amy Lovell | Ms Sandy Gill & Ms Julie Jones |
| 3.10-3.40pm | 2021 FULL 11877 | Visualising the Immunology of Rheumatic Heart Valves (VIV-Study) | Associate Professor Nikki Moreland | Mrs Helen Walker & Ms Albany Lucas |
| 3.40-4.10pm | 2021 FULL 11709 | AVT03-GL-P01: A Study to Compare AVT03 and Prolia® in Healthy Male Participants | Doctor Chris Wynne | Ms Jessie Lenagh-Glue & Dr Patries Herst |
|  |  | *Break* |  |  |
| 4.20-4.50pm | 2021 FULL 11871 | The effect of a positive pressure treadmill training in young people with cerebral palsy. | Dr. Pablo Ortega-Auriol | Ms Sandy Gill & Dr Peter Gallagher |
| 4.50-5.20pm | 2021 FULL 11728 | WN42444: A study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of gantenerumab in participants at risk for or at the earliest stages of Alzheimer's disease | Professor Tim Anderson | Mrs Helen Walker & Ms Julie Jones |
| 5.20-5.50pm | 2021 FULL 11603 | GB5121-2101 Study for relapsed/refractory primary or secondary central nervous system lymphoma | Dr Samar Issa | Dr Cordelia Thomas & Ms Julie Jones |
| 5.50-6.20pm | 2021 FULL 11848 | Phase 1 study of safety of VIS171 in healthy volunteers | Principal Investigator Alexandra Cole | Ms Jessie Lenagh-Glue & Dr Patries Herst |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Member Name** | **Member Category** | **Appointed** | **Term Expires** | **Apologies?** |
| Mrs Helen Walker | Lay (consumer/community perspectives) | 22/05/2018 | 22/05/2020 | Present |
| Mrs Sandy Gill | Lay (consumer/community perspectives) | 22/05/2020 | 22/05/2023 | Present |
| Dr Patries Herst | Non-lay (intervention studies) | 22/05/2020 | 22/05/2023 | Present |
| Dr Cordelia Thomas | Lay (the law) | 20/05/2017 | 20/05/2020 | Present |
| Dr Peter Gallagher | Non-lay (health/disability service provision) | 22/05/2020 | 22/05/2023 | Present |
| Ms Julie Jones | Non-lay (intervention studies) | 22/05/2020 | 22/05/2022 | Apologies |
| Ms Albany Lucas | Non-lay (observational studies) | 22/12/2021 | 22/12/2024 | Present |
| Ms Jessie Lenagh-Glue | Lay (ethical/moral reasoning) | 22/12/2021 | 22/12/2024 | Present |

## Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting at 11.30am and welcomed Committee members, noting that apologies had been received from Ms Julie Jones.

The Chair noted that the meeting was quorate.

The Committee noted and agreed the agenda for the meeting.

## Confirmation of previous minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 23 November 2021 were confirmed.

## New applications

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 EXP 11590** |
|  | Title: | Real World Data Collection Among Pediatric Neuroblastoma Patients Treated with Lorlatinib Through Expanded Access Program |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Dr Andrew Wood |
|  | Sponsor: | Pfizer |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

Kate Simpson and Laura Ladeluca were present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. Neuroblastoma (NB) is an aggressive solid tumour of childhood. The identification of anaplastic lymphoma kinase (ALK) as a critical factor in the development of neuroblastoma make it an attractive therapeutic target. Lorlatinib is a potent, brain-penetrant, third generation inhibitor of ALK. In preclinical models it exhibited superior potency towards ALK neuroblastoma tumor models, showing strong activity toward all tested ALK neuroblastoma mutations. The New Agents in Neuroblastoma Therapy (NANT) consortium has several ongoing clinical trials to identify best therapies and combination of therapies for treatment of pediatric patients with neuroblastoma.The overall goal of this real-world data collection is to assess demographic, clinical characteristics and real-world effectiveness and safety of lorlatinib-treated neuroblastoma patients outside of a clinical study.

Summary of resolved ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and addressed by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee asked if the peer reviewer is sufficiently independent of this application. The Researcher explained and understood the peer reviewer worked at Pfizer however they worked at the regulatory team and had nothing to do with the writing and creation of the protocol. The Researchers made it clear they were not a part of the creation of the study at all.
2. The Committee asked why the study needs pregnancy follow up data. The Researchers explained that is common Pfizer language and that their legal team reviewed it and asked the researchers to include it, researchers stated they can go back to legal and ask if they can remove it as it is not relevant to this study.
3. The Committee asked if the data collected will be used for future unspecified research. The researchers explained that they do not have any set plans for future research using the data collected from this data, further explaining that section was included if any future analysis is needed the data will be used, and that all data will be used for this research.

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

ASSENT FORM OLDER CHILDREN:

1. Please explain where the information is being collected from and what is being collected.
2. Please amend the second sentence under paragraph 2 adjust and include lay language that children can understand easily.

FUTURE UNSPECIFIED RESEARCH (FUR):

1. Please either clarify the first sentence under the section “E” to reflect what the plans are for FUR and if the data will be used in other studies or remove completely.

**Decision**

This application was *provisionally approved* by consensus, subject to the following information being received:

1. Please address all outstanding ethical issues, providing the information requested by the Committee.
2. Please update the participant information sheet and consent form, taking into account feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 7.15 – 7.17).*
3. Please update the study protocol, taking into account the feedback provided by the Committee. (National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 9.7).

After receipt of the information requested by the Committee, a final decision on the application will be made by Dr Cordelia Thomas and Dr Peter Gallagher.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 EXP 11484** |
|  | Title: | Genetic markers in Ovarian Cancer in New Zealand - NOVel |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Dr Byrony Simcock |
|  | Sponsor: |  |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

Dr Bryony Simcock was present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. Ovarian cancers are complex with many small differences - identifiable only by specialised laboratory tests. The study aims to look for these small differences in New Zealand women with ovarian cancer. The results of the study might show that some of the differences may make the tumour sensitive to specialised research trials which can then be recommended if appropriate. This project will establish a national programme for New Zealand women diagnosed with epithelial ovarian cancer.

Summary of resolved ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and addressed by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee asked if any Māori or Pasifika team members will have opportunities to advance their skills or mentoring support. The researcher explained that the study is very inclusive and will have opportunism for Māori and Pasifika members to advance their skills and be a part of more projects.

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee asked if gender neutral terminology could be adjusted to be more inclusive and to seek advice from LGBTQ+ organisations. These forms need to be amended to reflect the reality that women are not the only people who may be affected by ovarian cancer - trans men and non-binary or gender-fluid individuals may also be affected. Repeated use of the word "women" excludes and further stigmatizes other people who may have ovarian cancer. Something like "people affected by ovarian cancer, including women, trans men, and non-binary and gender-fluid individuals" can be used in the first instance, and simply "people with ovarian cancer" thereafter.”
2. The Committee queried lack of reimbursement. The Researcher explained that they have not budgeted for that and for this study they are not putting the participant through anything outside of every-day risk. The Committee explained that a reimbursement can be a small gesture as a token of appreciation (koha), and the researcher agreed that this would be acceptable.
3. The Committee asked about why tissue-banking was opt-out, not opt-in. After discussion, the researcher agreed to look at making it opt-in.

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

1. Please include in the PIS more information about the genetic testing explaining if this is genetic profiling of the tumour with emphasis on known mutations in ovarian cancer to allocate a specific sub type to the tissue, or a fishing expedition using full RNA sequence of tumour and blood cells.
2. Please explain terms and process in soft respectful language where possible.
3. Please ensure the correct HDEC is listed.
4. Please check for typos and grammatical errors.

**Decision**

This application was *approved* by consensus, subject to the following non-standard conditions:

* please address all outstanding ethical issues raised by the Committee
* please update the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form, taking into account the feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 7.15 – 7.17).*
* please update the study protocol, taking into account the feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 9.7).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 FULL 11498** |
|  | Title: | Rapid Avastin Treat and Extend Trial |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Dr Vidit Singh |
|  | Sponsor: |  |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

Dr Vidit Singh was present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. Determine the safety of 4-week T&E protocol for low-risk NvAMD patients receiving Avastin Increase capacity of medical retina and injection clinics, Prioritize AMD patients into high and low-risk groups, provide appropriate level of care and monitoring for the different groups of AMD patients based on their risk assessment.

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. Please amend your peer review by providing another peer review based on the HDEC template. Please supply an independent peer review for the current version of the study protocol. (National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 9.26).
2. The Committee advised the Researcher that relevant Māori cultural issues for this research would include touch of the head as tapu, information as a taonga and the potential for whakamā in participants. The Committee requested the researcher become familiar with these concepts and be mindful of this for future applications.
3. Please supply a more detailed data management plan to ensure the safety and integrity of participant data. This can be a standalone document or incorporated as part of the protocol *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 12.15).*
4. Please update the study protocol, taking into account the feedback provided by the Committee. (National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 9.7).

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

1. The Committee noted there are missing sections of the participant information sheet in order to obtain fully informed consent. The Committee recommended the Researcher adapt the [PIS template available on the HDEC website.](https://ethics.health.govt.nz/guides-templates-and-forms/participant-information-sheet-templates/)

This application was ***declined*** by consensus, as the Committee did not consider that the study would meet the ethical standards referenced above.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 FULL 11798** |
|  | Title: | Tramadol-adrenaline vs lignocaine-adrenaline: a randomised, double-blinded, split-mouth, clinical cross-over trial comparing post-op pain and OHRQoL following mandibular 3rd molar surgery. |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Dr Robert Mane |
|  | Sponsor: | University of Otago |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

No researcher was present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. The proposed research is a first double-blind, randomized placebo-controlled pilot trial to evaluate the trend of effect of novel HDtIGNS technique in individuals with early AD. This research will provide preliminary evidence on the safety, feasibility, and the effect of novel HD-TES parameters in individuals with early AD..

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee requested the researcher submit all surveys and questionnaires that will be used in the study.

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

1. The Committee noted there are missing sections of the participant information sheet in order to obtain fully informed consent. The Committee recommended the Researcher adapt the [PIS template available on the HDEC website.](https://ethics.health.govt.nz/guides-templates-and-forms/participant-information-sheet-templates/) This can be referred to in order to help address the issues raised below and any other missing information.
2. Please include when the questionnaires will be assessed in the participant information sheet.
3. Please include what will happen if signs of distress in participants occurs.
4. On page 4, please clarify exactly what is to be avoided and make it clear if there is an absolute prohibition.
5. Future Unspecified Research (FUR) should be yes/no on consent form.
6. Please add the right for participants to correct their data as well as access.
7. Please amend “you can withdraw from this study without it affecting your medical care” to reflect dental care.
8. Please provide the GP’s contact details.

**Decision**

This application was *provisionally approved* by consensus, subject to the following information being received:

1. Please address all outstanding ethical issues, providing the information requested by the Committee.
2. Please update the participant information sheet and consent form, taking into account feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 7.15 – 7.17).*

After receipt of the information requested by the Committee, a final decision on the application will be made by Dr Patries Herst and Mrs Helen Walker.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 FULL 11864** |
|  | Title: | Testing new brain stimulation technique for improving memory and function. |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Professor Dirk De Ridder |
|  | Sponsor: | University of Otago |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

Professor Dirk De Ridder and Divya Adhia were present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

Ms Jessie Lenagh-Glue declared a potential conflict of interest and the Committee decided to excuse her from discussion.

Summary of Study

1. The study aims to evaluate the feasibility and safety of the HD-tIGNS in individuals with early AD as well as to explore the trend of effect of the HD-tIGNS technique on the cognition and function in individuals with early AD; and the functional connectivity within and between the resting state triple brain networks.

Summary of resolved ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and addressed by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee queried the pacific consultation and advised the researchers contact the pacific research support unit within the researcher’s institute.
2. The Committee clarified that the recruitment process would be through another clinic that has already screened patients as well as looking at recruiting for elderly mental health care via the District Health Board (DHB). Determination of capacity would already have been assessed.

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee queried if there would be competence checks over the course of the study in the event of loss or difference in function over the 10-week period. However, it was agreed that it was incredibly unlikely that a person would deteriorate so quickly over the study course.

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

1. Please include that the participants may have multiple carers and are not required to withdraw should the carer opt out. Another carer can and will be arranged in this case.
2. Please include information for the participants around support in the event of a mental health crisis.
3. Please clarify the term “avoid” when concerning alcohol restriction during the study. Please amend to be definitive.
4. Please include tick boxes in the Future Unspecified Research question concerning data sharing in the consent form.
5. Please include the statement of the head being tāpu as a specific cultural consideration for pacific peoples as well as Māori.
6. Please consider a strategy for reviewing competency should a participant rapidly deteriorate.

**Decision**

This application was *approved* by consensus, subject to the following non-standard conditions:

* please address all outstanding ethical issues raised by the Committee
* please update the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form, taking into account the feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 7.15 – 7.17).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 EXP 11116** |
|  | Title: | Reboot Kids – A randomised controlled trial of a behavioural medicine intervention to prevent obesity and metabolic complications in young cancer survivors recently treatment (New Zealand pilot). |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Dr Amy Lovell |
|  | Sponsor: |  |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

No one from the research team was present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. The study aims to target whānau behaviour, around food habits and the home environment, to improve the dietary intake of vegetables of childhood cancer survivors, aged 2-12 years.

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee requests that the application be reviewed for clarity as per what the intention of the study is, how it will be carried out and the reasoning behind the study. *(National Ethical Standards* para 7.19)
2. The Committee requires information regarding how the study conduct will not be stigmatising given the statement around Māori being over-represented for obesity. *(National Ethical Standards* para 3.1)
3. The Committee requests consideration of potential for Whakamā specifically around the cost of fruit and vegetables and ‘healthy foods’ should the participants be financially struggling. (*National Ethical Standards* para 3.1)
4. The Committee requests clarification of the briefly outlined modules and that they be provided for review. *(National Ethical Standards* para 9.7a & 9.8)
5. The Committee requests clarification on the “LEAP database”, specifically what is this database and will the participants be contacted for research via this database. (*National Ethical Standards* para 12.31 – 12.39)

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

1. Please include information about ACC compensation. *(National Ethical Standards* para 8.3, 8.4 & 17.1-17.6)
2. Please specify who will have access to the data collected. *(National Ethical Standards* para 12.31 – 12.39)
3. Please include a statement or mention of koha or compensation for participants in the study.
4. Please include a consent form. *(National Ethical Standards* para 7.15)
5. Please specify that information will be sent to Australia. *(National Ethical Standards* para 12.31 – 12.39)
6. Please correct the contact number that is Australian, the information provided should be New Zealand specific. *(National Ethical Standards* para 7.16)
7. Please clarify if the child is the participant or if the parent is. The Data Management Plan (DMP) outlines the child as the participant, but the parent is the person filling out the questions about the child. (*National Ethical Standards* para 9.7a, 9,8, 7.19 & 7.15)
8. Please see the [HDEC template for the PIS](https://ethics.health.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/HDEC/templates/participant-information-sheet-consent-form-template-sep20.doc) and include the parts currently missing in the submission. *(National Ethical Standards* para 7.15 & 7.16)
9. Please include a header or footer with the document details. Such as study Identification number and page number.
10. Please provide information regarding who can participate, particularly around having to provide a General Practitioner (GP) or other health professional’s name. *(National Ethical Standards* para 7.15 & 7.16)
11. Please include a statement informing participants that a GP will be contacted in the event the researchers become concerned about the wellbeing of participants. This information is in the protocol but not in the PIS. *(National Ethical Standards* para 7.16)
12. Please include the statement from the submission doc E6 stating “Should any abnormal findings of potential clinical significance arise; the study coordinator will inform the lead oncologist for the participating parent/caregiver’s child and appropriate measures taken.”. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.16)
13. Please amend the statement “Did the program meet the participant's expectations and what were the participant's thoughts about the online and telephone components.” to use “your” instead of “participant’s”. *(National Ethical Standards* para 7.16)
14. Please specify if the transcripts of the audio recordings will be sent via post or by email. Pleas also specify how privacy will be protected whilst doing this. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.16 & 8.3)
15. Please amend all statements concerning retention of data to state that data will be stored for ten years following the youngest participant turning 16. This is specifically if the children are the participants and not the adults otherwise data merely must be stored for ten years. In accordance with New Zealand regulation. *(National Ethical Standards* para 6.28)
16. Please include a statement should there be intended future unspecified research (FUR) for this data. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.57)
17. Please list the ethics committee who approved the application. Please see the template text “This study has been approved by an independent group of people called a Health and Disability Ethics Committee (HDEC), who check that studies meet established ethical standards. The [insert Committee name] has approved this study.”.
18. Please clarify the methods by which the weight and height measurements of the child will be recorded. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.15)
19. Please include a safety plan in the event of a mental health crisis for the depression survey. *(National Ethical Standards* para 8.3 & 8.4)

**Decision**

This application was *declined* by consensus, as the Committee did not consider that the study would meet the ethical standards referenced above.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 FULL 11709** |
|  | Title: | AVT03-GL-P01: A Study to Compare AVT03 and Prolia® in Healthy Male Participants |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Dr Chris Wynne |
|  | Sponsor: | Alvotech Swiss AG. |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

Dr Chris Wynne and Courtney Rowse were present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. The study aims evaluate how safe and well tolerated AVT03 is, when compared to Prolia®, following a single dose in healthy participants. This will include measuring levels of AVT03 in the blood over time (pharmacokinetics), when compared to Prolia®, following a single dose in healthy participants. And assessing the body's immune response (immunogenicity) to AVT03, when compared to Prolia®, following a single dose in healthy participants.

Summary of resolved ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and addressed by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee queried if it was necessary to commence the study given there was a bioequivalent study currently being undertaken elsewhere globally. The researcher clarified that this was in the best interest of drug funding.
2. The Committee clarified the rationale of exclusion of women in the study was due to the pharmacokinetic focus of this study that wished to maintain a homogeneous population of younger people as the pharmacokinetics of post-menopausal women would provide too much variety in the pharmacodynamic outcomes in this group. It was expressed that the future intent was to include post-menopausal women in a later phase study, however the Committee maintained that there should be some discourse with the sponsor as to why the pharmacokinetics could not also be done in this population given that they are the target population for this drug.
3. The Committee clarified that only fluoride taken as a medication not fluoridation in water or toothpastes would be prohibited during participation in the study.
4. The Committee clarified why there was no dosage differences between groups, it was explained by the researcher that each group would be dosed the same however there would be a difference in the stages at which groups were dosed to assess the safety prior to dosing the entire cohort.

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee queried the rationale of inclusion of a specific population of Japanese participants and would like acknowledgement to this effect included in the protocol.
2. The Committee requested clarification on how the osteoclast differentiation assay would be conducted, how blood samples would be chosen and how the investigators can be sure of the numbers given the double-blind.
3. The Committee queried why there was no dosage differences between groups and for this to be noted.
4. The Committee requested that the scripts used for advertisements all make mention of reimbursement rather than only in the radio advert.

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

1. Please ensure the clarification flagged by the researcher in the meeting, as per the documentation on reimbursement for each group being out of order, is amended.

**Decision**

This application was *approved* by consensus, subject to the following non-standard conditions:

* please address all outstanding ethical issues raised by the Committee
* please update the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form, taking into account the feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 7.15 – 7.17).*
* please update the study protocol, taking into account the feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 9.7).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 FULL 11871** |
|  | Title: | The effect of a positive pressure treadmill training in young people with cerebral palsy. |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Dr. Pablo Ortega-Auriol |
|  | Sponsor: | University of Auckland |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

Dr Pablo Ortega-Auriol was present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. The study aims to determine the relative influence of two different gait training protocols, high and minimal body weight support (BWS), provided by a positive pressure treadmill over muscle coordination of children and adolescents with cerebral palsy.

Summary of resolved ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and addressed by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee clarified that the participants would still have access to the treadmill after the trial.

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee queried the use of control groups of healthy participants. As the study focuses on the before and after of people with cerebral palsy and not the difference between the muscle function between people without cerebral palsy and those with. (*National Ethical Standards* para 9.7)
2. The Committee recommended narrowing the age range of participants to people only with Cerebral Palsy and potentially removing the 16–18-year-olds. With potential for an amendment in the future that could then further to this assess participants without cerebral palsy. (*National Ethical Standards* para 9.7*)*
3. The Committee requests and suggests that the researcher approaches the Institute research board and have them review and aid in the development of future applications.
4. The Committee requests that the potential for Whakamā be considered in the cultural statement as there may be a lot of potential shame and a wish to hide their situation in participants and their parents that is currently unaddressed in the documentation provided. *(National Ethical Standards* para *3.3)*

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

General PIS/CF:

1. Please include a specific and transparent statement about the potential fees for use of the treadmill and clinic after the trial is concluded. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.15 & 7.16*)*
2. Please include headers and footers, including page numbers, study ID and dates.
3. Please review for clarity between study groups in your documentation. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.15 & 7.16*)*
4. Please review for spelling and grammatical errors. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.15 & 7.16*)*
5. Please review for lay language and clarify terms intended to describe the study to the participants. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.19*)*
6. Please amend the cultural statement to correlate with the [HDEC cultural statement.](https://ethics.health.govt.nz/guides-templates-and-forms/cultural-questions-guidance/)
7. Please review the use of language in the consent forms (CF) particularly for younger individuals to remove overly technical terms. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.15 & 7.16*)*
8. Please review the titles of all CFs in order to be less exclusive for example the committee suggests not placing age labels on the forms and utilize instead “Younger child” “Older child” and, “Adult” as the groupings. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.19*)*

PIS/CF for children/ young people:

1. Please simplify and reduce the content of the PIS/CFs to make them informative for children, as currently they are quite dense and overly verbose for that age group. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.19*)*
2. Please utilize pictures and diagrams to help explain the process they will be going through in a more simplified manner. (*National Ethical Standards* para 7.19*)*

**Decision**

This application was *declined* by consensus, as the Committee did not consider that the study would meet the ethical standards referenced above.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 FULL 11728** |
|  | Title: | WN42444: A study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of gantenerumab in participants at risk for or at the earliest stages of Alzheimer's disease |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Professor Tim Anderson |
|  | Sponsor: | Roche Products (New Zealand) Ltd. |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

Professor Tim Anderson, Laura Paermentier and Steve Duffy were present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. The primary purpose of this secondary prevention study is to evaluate the efficacy, safety, pharmacodynamics, and pharmacokinetics of gantenerumab, an anti-amyloid β antibody, in amyloid-positive, cognitively unimpaired participants at risk for or at the earliest stages of Alzheimer’s disease (AD).

Summary of resolved ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and addressed by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Sponsor confirmed that compassionate access programme will be available to those who are shown to have benefit from it
2. The Committee queried what the Observer Participant Information Sheet was for and if this differed to the Study Partner. The researcher clarified that this was for if a dose is administered at home, and anyone available to the participant (Study Partner or another person) would be present for an hour following the dose.

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee queried why there are a number of questionnaires and the study partner involvement. After discussion, the Committee stated that a participant needs to know that their study partner is answering questions about them without them present, and reassure participants that a study partner can be replaced during the study if needed. This information should be provided in the participant information sheet, along with assurances that their study partner being unable to continue is not their exit to the study.

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

1. Flow diagram for start of PISs for the pre-screening and study visits for all to be able to understand the study.
2. Please review all PISs for lay-language.

Main PIS

1. On page 5, “If you decide to receive your target dose as 2 injections once every 2 weeks, you will undergo Step 3.1 (followed by Step 4.1). If you decide to receive your target dose as 1 injection once every week, you will undergo Step 3.2 (followed by Step 4.2). “ this doesn’t seem to align with the step descriptions: “Two 1.7 mL injections (510 mg gantenerumab or placebo) once every 4 weeks, OR One 1.7 mL injection (255 mg gantenerumab or placebo) once every 2 weeks, for 3 months according to your choice”. Please amend.
2. The dosing frequency in the text seems to be double that of the step frequency.
3. Information in reproductive risks section, especially about breast feeding, seems redundant. The study is for 60–80-year-olds. If they are post-menopausal then they shouldn’t need all of this information. Or if their partner is not post-menopausal then they will just need to use male contraception. Post-menopausal women shouldn’t need a pregnancy test either. The Committee suggested this is checked with a blood test for menopausal status. Please reword around reproductive concerns to state that it is unlikely in this age group a blood test will be taken around post-menopausal status.
4. Please include a statement about SCOTT approval e.g. The scientific aspects of this study have been approved by the Standing Committee on Therapeutic Trials (SCOTT), which is part of Medsafe.
5. Please mention in the body of the PIS that their GP will be notified about their participation in the trial and significant abnormal results. At present mental health issues are mentioned in relation to GP but not other aspects.
6. Please include in the consent form about agreeing to their ‘study partner’ being contacted and asked questions about them. “With your consent, he/she will also be allowed to help administering the study treatment.”
7. Clarify what “life-threatening” means or re-phrase.
8. CF should include an item about sending data overseas as well as future use of data.

Pre-screening PIS.

1. Duplication: “Whether or not you take part in this pre-screening is your choice. If you do want to take part now, but change your mind later, you can pull out of the study at any time” has repeated information in the next paragraph.
2. Please mention the notification to GP in the body of the PIS. This is currently first raised in the CF.

Study Partner PIS

1. The Committee queried why it is necessary to outline in the CF that the GP is being notified of their involvement.
2. Please clarify what health information is being collected about the study partner. If none, please remove all references to it.

**Decision**

This application was *provisionally approved* by consensus, subject to the following information being received:

1. Please address all outstanding ethical issues, providing the information requested by the Committee.
2. Please update the participant information sheet and consent form, taking into account feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 7.15 – 7.17)*

After receipt of the information requested by the Committee, a final decision on the application will be made by Mrs Helen Walker and Ms Julie Jones.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 FULL 11877** |
|  | Title: | Visualising the Immunology of Rheumatic Heart Valves (VIV-Study) |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Associate Professor Nikki Moreland |
|  | Sponsor: |  |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022 |

Associate Professor Nikki Moreland was present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. This is a prospective observational study that will use heart tissue that is normally discarded during routine RHD surgeries, as well as a pre-surgical blood sample. The aim of this study is improve understanding of immune activities in rheumatic heart disease by profile circulating immune cells in blood of RHD patients and visualising the immune cells in valve tissue removed during surgery in the same patients.

Summary of resolved ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and addressed by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee was satisfied that there is appropriate Māori and Pacific input into the study design, conduct and dissemination of the results.

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee noted the current koha may be too low due to the challenging time it is for participants and families of them and the cultural impact of taking blood and tissue. The Committee suggested increasing the koha or offering other things like a food basket as well.
2. The Committee noted that if a child is still in the research when they turn 16, they must reconsent at 16 for continued use of their data/samples. This can be using the adult information and be advised that their parents consented with their assent, but now they are an adult they provide their own consent.
3. Please amend in all documents the word “caregiver” to be “guardian”.

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

1. Please further clarify or elaborate further the context around how rheumatic heart disease affects Māori and Pacific populations in New Zealand.
2. Please simplify the term “surgically required” on page 2.
3. On page 4 with disposal of tissue, please mention that tissue can be returned to participant or family.
4. Intermittent and inconsistent use of “you” and “you and your child”. The Committee suggested inclusion of a clarifying paragraph at the front that says when it says “you”, it refers to “you and/or your child”.
5. Please correct “healthy” insurance to “health” insurance
6. Please detail that people have the right to access and correct information gathered about them.
7. PIS and CF are inconsistent in discussing samples of blood. Please clarify that this is one sample drawn.
8. Please amend point in CF about “my tissue” to be “my child’s tissue”.
9. Please include more information on what will happen to the data, such as what identifiable information is needed, what this is, who has access, etc. Information in the data management can be put into the PIS.

Assent 11-16

1. Please include the word “in” between “common” and “New Zealand” on the first page.
2. Please simplify words such as confidentiality.
3. Please rephrase the statement that no one will be “angry” with them if they don’t want to participate. Instead reword to say that it is their choice if they want to be in the study.
4. Amend “samples” to be singular.
5. Please include the cultural paragraph and all the contact numbers.

**Decision**

This application was *provisionally approved* by consensus, subject to the following information being received:

1. Please address all outstanding ethical issues, providing the information requested by the Committee.
2. Please update the participant information sheet and consent form, taking into account feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 7.15 – 7.17).*
3. Please update the study protocol, taking into account the feedback provided by the Committee. (National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 9.7).

After receipt of the information requested by the Committee, a final decision on the application will be made by Mrs Helen Walker and Ms Albany Lucas.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | **Ethics ref:** | **2021 FULL 11848** |
|  | Title: | Phase 1 study of safety of VIS171 in healthy volunteers |
|  | Principal Investigator: | Dr Alexandra Cole |
|  | Sponsor: | Visterra Inc. |
|  | Clock Start Date: | 13 January 2022. |

Dr Alexandra Cole, Dr Chris Wynne and Sharmin Bala were present via videoconference for discussion of this application.

Potential conflicts of interest

The Chair asked members to declare any potential conflicts of interest related to this application.

No potential conflicts of interest related to this application were declared by any member.

Summary of Study

1. VIS171 is under development for the treatment of autoimmune diseases with an underlying mechanism attributed to T cell dysregulation. VIS171 is a fusion protein containing modified human interleukin-2 (IL-2) and a human antibody fragment crystallizable (Fc) domain. Nonclinical studies have demonstrated that VIS171 has a robust and specific effect on regulatory T cell (Treg) expansion. The purpose of this first-in-human (FIH) study is to assess the safety, tolerability, pharmacodynamics (PD), and pharmacokinetics (PK) of subcutaneous (SC) VIS171 in healthy participants (single ascending dose [SAD] - Part A) as well as in participants with autoimmune diseases (multiple ascending dose [MAD] - Part B). This application is for Part A only.

Summary of outstanding ethical issues

The main ethical issues considered by the Committee and which require addressing by the Researcher are as follows.

1. The Committee queried if the aggregate of $5million NZD would be enough and recommended that $10million would be more appropriate. This can come through as an updated insurance certificate by way of amendment.
2. Please ensure all advertisements mention reimbursements.

The Committee requested the following changes to the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (PIS/CF):

1. Please simplify using lay language, i.e., description of VIS171, medical terms used
2. The formatting of the document made it hard to read, including small margins, small line spacing and small font. Please review and amend.
3. Under risks, “there may be unknown side-effects…with other drugs you are taking.” As these are healthy volunteers, this risk is unlikely, otherwise please clarify.
4. Please include a visit table to outline the study procedures.
5. On page 9, there is a repetition of statements, please review.
6. Please include the address of where the clinic visits will be and clarify how long they will need to stay onsite.
7. Please clarify what is required of participants when they are staying onsite (i.e. if they can leave, have visitors, etc.)
8. Please clarify what azoospermia is.

**Decision**

This application was *approved* by consensus, subject to the following non-standard conditions:

* please address all outstanding ethical issues raised by the Committee
* please update the Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form, taking into account the feedback provided by the Committee. *(National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement, para 7.15 – 7.17).*

## General business

1. The Chair reminded the Committee of the date and time of its next scheduled meeting:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Meeting date:** | 22 February 2022 |
| **Zoom details:** | To be determined |

1. **Review of Last Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed and signed by the Chair and Co-ordinator as a true record.

1. **Matters Arising**
2. **Other business**
3. **Other business for information**
4. **Any other business**

The meeting closed at 6.20pm