

MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES - REVIEWER DUTIES

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Non-affiliated reviewer | Non-affiliated members are expected to provide input regarding their knowledge about the local community and be willing to discuss issues and research from that perspective. |
| Non-scientific reviewer | Non-scientific members are expected to provide input on areas germane to their knowledge, expertise and experience, professional and otherwise. For example, members who are lawyers should present the legal views of specific areas that may be discussed, such as exculpatory language or state requirements regarding consent. Non-scientific members should advise the IRB if additional expertise in a non-scientific area is required to assess if the protocol adequately protects the rights and welfare of subjects. |
| Scientific reviewer | Scientific reviewers are expected to contribute to the evaluation of a study on its scientific and statistical merits and standards of practice. These members should also be able to advise the IRB if additional expertise in a non-scientific area is required to assess if the protocol adequately protects the rights and welfare of subjects. |
| Primary review team | In addition to the duties described in SOP OR 203, section 1.3.2, each regular member or alternate member will be expected to act as a primary reviewer for assigned studies at convened meetings. The primary reviewer presents his or her findings resulting from review of the application materials and provides an assessment of the soundness and safety of the protocol and recommendations specific actions to the IRB. Any member of the primary reviewer team may lead the IRB discussion of the study. The primary reviewers may be required to review additional material requested by the IRB for the purpose of study approval. |