

The 16th Institutional Review Board Meeting (FY2018) (Expedited review)

Date: March 13, 2019 (Wednesday), 10:00-11:25

Place: Auditorium (Hiroshima), 3rd fl. meeting room (Nagasaki) (teleconference)

Participants: Dr. Kodama and Ms. Shinohara (co-chairpersons), Ms. Ogawa (members)

< Review concerning human subject research >

	Department	Research project title	Review results	Summary
1	Statistics	CR151: “Quantifying Residual Time Acceleration among Atomic Bomb Survivors” (Morenz <i>et al.</i>)	Approved	<p>1) Revise the RP, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In the “study period,” replace “methodological examination to achieve the study purpose started” with “methodological examination to achieve the study purpose will start.” (Relevant to the Japanese version only) ➤ Revise “Ethical issues” into “ethical consideration.” (Relevant to the Japanese version only) ➤ In 1) Management of Personal information of Ethical Issues, revision will be made to clarify that the data recipient cannot identify individuals. ➤ In 2) Explanation of the Study and Informed Consent of Ethical Issues, revision will be made to clarify that the explanation refers to both use of information at RERF and provision of information to UW. <p>2) Check “Yes” in “8 - Procedures for obtaining informed consent” of the checklist (RP), Form 2-2-1.</p> <p>3) Inability to guarantee opt-out opportunities is accepted; use Information Disclosure Form (Form 1-5-1).</p> <p>4) Revise Information Disclosure Form (Form 1-5-1), as follows (relevant to the Japanese version only):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In “Objective of use” of the Information Disclosure Based on the Guidelines, the Japanese word <i>bakuro</i> will be replaced with <i>hibaku</i> for radiation exposure. ➤ In addition, the second paragraph in “Objective of use” will be deleted. ➤ The third paragraph in “Objective of use” will be revised into one easy for the general citizens to understand. ➤ Use of more polite style is advised. <p>5) In I.8.1) of Application for Ethical Review, check a) RERF General Fund, not b) External grant.</p>

*With regard to the aforementioned issues, IRB confirmed that proper revisions were made.