RegenMed

ARTICLE

RIGHT-SIZING COMPLIANCE

IRB and data-use frameworks calibrated to study risk, not inherited from drug trials.

www.rgnmed.com | circles@rgnmed.com

THE BUREAUCRATIC PARADOX

Regulation protects patients. Bureaucracy protects itself. Over the past three decades, the noble goal of ethical oversight has been conflated with procedural maximalism. In clinical research today, the amount of documentation required to ask a low-risk question about routine care can rival that of a novel drug trial. The implicit message is that all research carries equal danger — and must therefore suffer equal delay.

This one-size-fits-all approach has throttled the middle tier of science. Small, low-risk, hypothesis-driven studies suffocate under paperwork meant for pharmacologic interventions. The result is moral inversion: rules written to safeguard participants now prevent the very knowledge that could make their care safer.

HOW WE GOT HERE

The overreach is historical. In the 1970s, research scandals demanded guardrails, and Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) rightly imposed rigor and transparency. But over time, compliance expanded to include liability management, institutional reputation, and grant eligibility.

Each incident of noncompliance added another layer, and each layer became permanent — regardless of risk context. A simple chart review about postoperative recovery can now require months of negotiation between legal, IT security, and privacy offices, even when all data are de-identified.

The irony is that high-risk interventional trials have clear, well-practiced regulatory pathways. It is the small, noninterventional, real-world study — the safest category — that gets lost in procedural purgatory.

RISK-PROPORTIONAL OVERSIGHT

True ethics requires proportionality. A study that cannot physically or psychologically harm a participant should not face the same administrative gauntlet as one that can.

A. Tiered Review.

- *Exempt:* Retrospective de-identified data or quality improvement analyses.
- *Expedited:* Minimal-risk prospective observational work.
- *Full Board:* Interventions that alter care pathways or expose participants to risk.

B. Parallel Pathways.

Regulatory review and contract approval can run concurrently, not sequentially. The only sequential dependency should be ethical approval preceding data access — not financial paperwork.

C. Expiration by Default.

Every added regulatory requirement should expire unless renewed for cause. The default should be simplicity, not complexity.

These are not abstractions; they are operational reforms that halve approval times without eroding safeguards.

COMPLIANCE AS AN ENABLER, NOT A GATE

The compliance function should measure itself not by documents processed but by insights enabled. Modern IRBs could adopt service-level agreements: 60-day turnaround targets, with transparent public metrics. They could also use templates for low-risk protocols and automate common approvals. The same digital infrastructure that tracks grant spending could easily track review timelines and bottlenecks. Transparency would convert compliance from an obstacle into an ally — a partner visibly accelerating safe science.

GLOBAL EXAMPLES

Countries that have embraced proportional oversight—such as the UK's Health Research Authority and Singapore's MOH—show that right-sizing works. Streamlined pathways increased application volume without any rise in adverse events.

In both models, independent audit replaces redundant review, and clarity replaces paperwork. The result is faster learning and broader participation in research across community and private settings — precisely where most patients actually receive care.

MORAL AND PRACTICAL CLARITY

True ethics is not a checklist; it is an attitude toward uncertainty. A system that prevents inquiry into safe, low-risk questions does not protect patients; it abandons them to untested routines.

Right-sizing compliance does not mean deregulation — it means rehumanization. It reclaims the spirit of oversight: to ensure that science proceeds both swiftly and safely, guided by judgment rather than fear.

SELECTED REFERENCES

- RegenMed *(2025). Genuine Medical Research Has Lost Its Way*. White Paper.
- Emanuel, E., et al. (2000). *What Makes Clinical Research Ethical? JAMA*.
- UK Health Research Authority (2023). *Proportionate Review Pathways*.
- Berwick, D. (2016). *Learning Health Systems and the Ethics of Progress. Health Affairs*.
- OECD (2022). *Streamlined Oversight for Low-Risk Research*.

GET INVOLVED OR LEARN MORE — CONTACT US TODAY!

If you are interested in contributing to this important initiative or learning more about how you can be involved, please contact us*:

RegenMed | www.rgnmed.com

circles@rgnmed.com

*If the links do not work for you, please download the PDF.