

each year are for new uses of previously approved drugs, which turn off-label uses into on-label ones.⁴ This gateway function remains a key way of ensuring that health care is based on robust science, so that patients are protected and wasteful spending is minimized.

Still, sensing that the time may be ripe for a major policy shift, the drug and biologics industry recently released proposed guidelines for a new approach to off-label promotion.⁵ They seek a rollback of FDA regulation, so that they can instead “responsibly” promote new uses to physicians, even beyond the safe harbors the FDA already allows. The FDA, for its part, is undertaking a comprehensive review of its rules about off-label promotion.

We fear that these developments could be the beginning of

an FDA retreat from the FDCA’s fundamental precepts, which require that basic standards for proof of safety and efficacy be met for every intended use of a drug or high-risk medical device. Rather than acceding to the views of two judges in one federal circuit, we hope that the FDA continues to stand on principle. The U.S. Constitution should not be misconstrued in such a way as to undermine the primary functions of federal regulation in this area: to protect patients and to create a high-quality market for drugs and devices that is driven by science rather than hype.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available at NEJM.org.

From the Regulatory Science Program and James E. Rogers College of Law, University of Arizona, Tucson (C.R.); New York University School of Law, New York (C.R.); and the Program on Regulation, Therapeutics, and Law (PORTAL), Division of Pharmacoeconomic

and Pharmacoeconomics, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women’s Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston (A.S.K.).

This article was published on November 2, 2016, at NEJM.org.

1. Radley DC, Finkelstein SN, Stafford RS. Off-label prescribing among office-based physicians. *Arch Intern Med* 2006;166:1021-6.
2. Hey SP, Kesselheim AS. An uninformative truth: the logic of Amarin’s off-label promotion. *PLoS Med* 2016;13(3):e1001978.
3. Robertson C. When truth cannot be presumed: the regulation of drug promotion under an expanding First Amendment. *Boston Univ Law Rev* 2014;94:545-74.
4. Wang B, Kesselheim AS. Characteristics of efficacy evidence supporting approval of supplemental indications for prescription drugs in United States, 2005-14: systematic review. *BMJ* 2015;351:h4679.
5. Biotechnology Innovation Organization, Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America. Principles on responsible sharing of truthful and non-misleading information about medicines with health care professionals and payers. 2016 (https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/PrinciplesReport_FINAL.pdf).

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1611755

Copyright © 2016 Massachusetts Medical Society.

 An audio interview with Dr. Robertson is available at NEJM.org

NIH Policy on Single-IRB Review — A New Era in Multicenter Studies

Ann-Margret Ervin, Ph.D., M.P.H., Holly A. Taylor, Ph.D., M.P.H., and Stephan Ehrhardt, M.D., M.P.H.

Review of the ethics of multicenter clinical studies is typically conducted by the institutional review board (IRB) of each participating center. Extensive evidence suggests that the current practice is costly, is unnecessarily duplicative, and delays commencement of research.¹ The U.S. government has permitted single-IRB review and other streamlined review models since 1991, but few investigators have taken advantage of those options.²

In June 2016, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) issued new guidance on single-IRB re-

view of multicenter studies.³ The policy was introduced as a means to increase the efficiency of multicenter studies, reduce the time to study initiation, promote consistency of ethics review, alleviate the burden on investigators and administrators, and eventually reduce research costs. Under the new policy, U.S. centers participating in NIH-funded multicenter studies must use a single IRB for initial and ongoing ethics review. As of May 25, 2017, this policy will apply to investigators submitting applications for non-exempt multicenter studies involv-

ing human participants and using a common study protocol. The policy does not apply if it is prohibited by “federal, tribal, or state law, regulation or policy.”³ The NIH will consider other exceptions with appropriate justification.

The single-IRB policy ushers in new and important responsibilities for investigators. A proposal for use of a single IRB must be included with the initial application, and at that time all involved U.S. institutions must agree to use the selected IRB. If funding is awarded, federal guidance requires a signed IRB-authorization agree-

ment between each participating institution and the single IRB outlining the roles and responsibilities of investigators, institutions, and the IRB. The principal investigator must ensure that the selected IRB is qualified to serve as the single IRB and that all authorization agreements and communication plans among the various centers and the selected IRB are in place. Even though in practice institutional counsel and IRB administrators will probably negotiate and execute IRB-authorization agreements, investigators must understand their responsibilities under such agreements.

Although the response to the policy has been very positive over-

view activities may be included as direct costs. NIH intramural IRBs may serve as a study's single IRB but are prohibited from receiving funding.

Many established academic IRB consortia are well placed to conduct single-IRB review, but some academic IRBs may require extensive modifications to information systems and standard operating procedures to accommodate the new approach.^{3,5} Institutions will need to allocate substantial resources before May 2017, and it is unclear whether and how these costs will be recovered. Resources required for single-IRB review may well exceed available indirect funds.³ As a result, academic in-

center studies that include both academic institutions and investigators without IRB affiliation. Independent IRBs have standard operating procedures specific to single-IRB review, the infrastructure to manage and monitor administrative functions, and a fee schedule for the activities outlined in the NIH policy. Although independent IRBs may therefore have an advantage in the new single-IRB era, academic IRBs should also participate in reviewing NIH-funded multicenter studies. Without a critical mass of both academic and independent IRBs prepared to serve in this capacity, the expected gains in efficiency may be delayed or unrealized.

A second challenge lies in the uncertainty regarding the regulatory and legal liability of investigators and institutions when an unaffiliated IRB reviews their study — uncertainty that will remain until a new federal liability policy is developed.³ A proposed modification to the federal policy on the protection of human participants includes an assurance that the single IRB would be held responsible if there are deficiencies in ethics review. Unfortunately, final approval of that policy may not occur before the single-IRB requirement becomes effective.

A third concern is the efficiency of the IRB review process. The need to interact with only one IRB is clearly an advantage, since it eliminates the delays associated with duplicative IRB review, but there are two provisions that may extend the time to study commencement. First, executing the required IRB-authorization agreements will take a variable amount of time, potentially up to several months. These

The NIH expects that the benefits of this transition will be realized as use of single IRBs increases, but it will monitor outcomes such as time to research initiation and threats to the protection of participants.

all, public comments highlight several challenges to streamlining ethics review.³ The first challenge relates to the costs of single-IRB review. The NIH has released guidance on allocation of costs for single-IRB activities.⁴ When the single IRB is affiliated with an institution that is receiving funds for conduct of the study in question, ethics and consent-form review must be covered as “indirect costs.” Review of local materials and investigator credentials and communications with the participating centers may be included as “direct costs.” If the single IRB is unaffiliated with the participating institutions — is, for instance, an independent IRB that operates on a fee-for-service basis — all re-

stitutions may be reluctant to assume the costs of single-IRB review in the absence of explicit reimbursement. These institutions may also not yet have enough data to appropriately estimate the direct costs. Surely, decisions regarding the application of direct and indirect costs will weigh heavily in the selection of the single IRB.

Given the barriers to single-IRB review for some academic institutions, investigators may consider, or institutions may suggest, relying on independent IRBs. Such IRBs were initially established to provide single-center and multicenter study ethics reviews for investigators who lacked an IRB affiliation, but they have also served as the single IRB for multi-

agreements must be negotiated with the selected single IRB each time a study is funded, unless otherwise specified. This requirement may at least initially counteract the expected gains in efficiency. The NIH hopes that use of existing IRB-agreement templates will expedite this process. It appears prudent for institutions to also discuss roles and responsibilities prior to the notice of award. Second, the NIH discourages but does not prohibit duplicative ethics review by local IRBs. Institutions might therefore impose local-IRB review under certain conditions and before study enrollment at their center. Since IRB agreements are often negotiated individually, this provision may affect some but not all participating centers and may result in considerable delay of study commencement.

The NIH expects that the benefits of this transition will be realized as use of single IRBs increases, but it will monitor outcomes such as time to research initiation and threats to

the protection of participants. Since utilization of single-IRB review has been limited, data on long-term outcomes have not been available or have not been published. We do not yet know whether streamlining IRB review will affect an IRB's ability to protect the welfare of human participants. Widespread adoption of single-IRB review will provide a wealth of empirical data for assessing the utility of this practice in the United States. IRBs do not typically divulge information regarding deliberations or administrative metrics, although metrics may be examined internally. These data need to be accessible, collected, analyzed, and reported systematically.¹

We anticipate that with time, angst over this new policy will lessen, as evidence is collected to confirm the prophesied advantages. Implementation of the policy should be seen as a work in progress, and modifications and clarifications may be required as outcomes data are analyzed. Ultimately, a high-quality, efficient

ethics-review process is a public health good.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available at [NEJM.org](http://www.nejm.org).

From the Department of Epidemiology (A.-M.E., S.E.) and the Department of Health Policy and Management (H.A.T.), Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, and the Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics (H.A.T.) — both in Baltimore.

1. Abbott L, Grady C. A systematic review of the empirical literature evaluating IRBs: what we know and what we still need to learn. *J Empir Res Hum Res Ethics* 2011;6:3-19.
2. Ervin AM, Taylor HA, Meinert CL, Ehrhardt S. Evidence gaps and ethical review of multicenter studies. *Science* 2015;350:632-3.
3. Final NIH policy on the use of a single institutional review board for multi-site research. Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health, June 21, 2016 (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-16-094.html>).
4. Scenarios to illustrate the use of direct and indirect costs for single IRB review under the NIH policy on the use of a single IRB for multi-site research. Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health, June 21, 2016 (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-16-109.html>).
5. Kaufmann P, O'Rourke PP. Central institutional review board review for an academic trial network. *Acad Med* 2015;90:321-3.

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1608766

Copyright © 2016 Massachusetts Medical Society.

Breakthroughs for Whom? Global Diabetes Care and Equitable Design

Amy Moran-Thomas, Ph.D.

Ms. L. showed me the empty container of test strips and a box with butterflies on it. They were for a glucometer model I'd never seen before, called a FreeStyle. She explained that the machine had been given to her a few years earlier by a student philanthropic group from Arkansas on a "medical mission" trip to her village in Belize. She'd also been given a 3-month supply of the

costly testing strips the machine required, which she'd stretched for nearly a year. Then she ran out, and there was nowhere in Belize to get more strips. That was 2 years ago.

I hesitantly agreed to bring her more strips when I next returned from the United States. They were unavailable at CVS, but I located some at Walgreens. At \$70, they seemed both too expensive and

completely insufficient — only a 30-day supply. But this dilemma turned out to be beside the point: Ms. L. had a FreeStyle Lite, not an original FreeStyle, so after a return trip down miles of dusty back-country roads in a borrowed truck, we discovered that the strips didn't work on her machine.

It would be difficult to overstate the magnitude of such problems for global diabetes care. As