



Perspectives of Researchers and Research Team Members Regarding Their Experience with sIRBs

BHUCHITRA SINGH, AILEEN ZHANG, ARUN H. PATIL, ABIGAIL COCO, IBELLE MADERA, SARAH OLSON, KRISTIN VOEGTLINE, ENRIQUE SCHISTERMAN, AND JAMES SEGARS

Supplemental Digital Appendix C: Multivariate models with four simulated categories for Cluster Analysis of sIRB User Ratings of sIRB Onboarding, Cost-Effectiveness, Timeline, or Administrative Burden using multivariate

	Odds Ratios (95% CI) Assuming Total Independence (756 sites)			
	Positive Response to sIRB Onboarding	Positive Response to sIRB Cost-Effectiveness	Negative Response to sIRB Timelines	Negative Response to sIRB Administrative Burden
sIRB super-user (Yes vs No)	1.72 (1.21 – 2.43)	1.93 (1.37 – 2.73)	0.85 (0.59 – 1.24)	0.77 (0.54 – 1.1)
Institution specific application requirement (Yes vs No)	0.44 (0.28 – 0.69)	0.74 (0.48 – 1.14)	2.04 (1.22 – 3.42)	2.45 (1.54 – 3.91)
Role (Coordinator/Research Nurse vs Investigator)	1.1 (0.77 – 1.58)	0.89 (0.63 – 1.27)	0.63 (0.44 – 0.92)	0.74 (0.52 – 1.05)
Role (Regulatory/Manager vs Investigator)	0.79 (0.53 – 1.18)	0.64 (0.43 – 0.95)	0.68 (0.45 – 1.03)	1.21 (0.81 – 1.8)
	Odds Ratios (95% CI) Assuming Minimal Clustering by IP Address (684 sites)			
	Positive Response to sIRB Onboarding	Positive Response to sIRB Cost-Effectiveness	Negative Response to sIRB Timelines	Negative Response to sIRB Administrative Burden
sIRB super-user (Yes vs No)	1.72 (1.21 - 2.43)	1.93 (1.36 - 2.74)	0.85 (0.59 - 1.23)	0.77 (0.54 - 1.1)
Institution specific application requirement (Yes vs No)	0.44 (0.28 - 0.69)	0.74 (0.48 - 1.14)	2.04 (1.23 - 3.4)	2.45 (1.53 - 3.93)
Role (Coordinator/Research Nurse vs Investigator)	1.1 (0.77 - 1.58)	0.89 (0.63 - 1.28)	0.63 (0.44 - 0.92)	0.74 (0.52 - 1.05)
Role (Regulatory/Manager vs Investigator)	0.79 (0.52 - 1.2)	0.64 (0.42 - 0.96)	0.68 (0.45 - 1.02)	1.21 (0.82 - 1.79)
	Odds Ratios (95% CI) Assuming More Minimal Clustering by Geolocation (523 sites)			

	Positive Response to sIRB Onboarding	Positive Response to sIRB Cost-Effectiveness	Negative Response to sIRB Timelines	Negative Response to sIRB Administrative Burden
sIRB super-user (Yes vs No)	1.72 (1.21 - 2.44)	1.93 (1.37 - 2.72)	0.85 (0.59 - 1.23)	0.77 (0.54 - 1.11)
Institution specific application requirement (Yes vs No)	0.44 (0.29 - 0.68)	0.74 (0.48 - 1.14)	2.04 (1.24 - 3.36)	2.45 (1.53 - 3.94)
Role (Coordinator/Research Nurse vs Investigator)	1.1 (0.77 - 1.57)	0.89 (0.63 - 1.26)	0.63 (0.45 - 0.9)	0.74 (0.52 - 1.05)
Role (Regulatory/Manager vs Investigator)	0.79 (0.52 - 1.2)	0.64 (0.41 - 0.99)	0.68 (0.44 - 1.04)	1.21 (0.81 - 1.81)

	Odds Ratios (95% CI) Assuming Extreme Clustering by City (223 sites)			
	Positive Response to sIRB Onboarding	Positive Response to sIRB Cost-Effectiveness	Negative Response to sIRB Timelines	Negative Response to sIRB Administrative Burden
sIRB super-user (Yes vs No)	1.72 (1.15 - 2.56)	1.93 (1.3 - 2.87)	0.85 (0.59 - 1.24)	0.77 (0.52 - 1.15)
Institution specific application requirement (Yes vs No)	0.44 (0.29 - 0.66)	0.74 (0.49 - 1.11)	2.04 (1.22 - 3.43)	2.45 (1.57 - 3.84)
Role (Coordinator/Research Nurse vs Investigator)	1.1 (0.77 - 1.59)	0.89 (0.63 - 1.28)	0.63 (0.44 - 0.91)	0.74 (0.5 - 1.09)
Role (Regulatory/Manager vs Investigator)	0.79 (0.52 - 1.21)	0.64 (0.43 - 0.95)	0.68 (0.45 - 1.01)	1.21 (0.82 - 1.78)

^a Bolded values indicate statistically significant odds ratios, where certain sIRB users (moderate or super-users, those with or without an institution-specific application requirement, study coordinator or leading investigator role, or regulatory manager or leading investigator role) have a higher or lower odds of rating a measure of sIRB efficiency (onboarding, cost-effectiveness, timeline, or administrative burden) with a positive or negative valence. Overall, model estimates of sIRB ratings did not differ across all four levels of clustering and suggested that clustering did not impact our ability to evaluate sIRB perspectives.