



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 D: Complete summary of participant responses on sIRB experience and efficiency by institution-specific application requirement (ISAR) and study role

	INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS (ISARs)					STUDY ROLES ^e				
Experiential Questions	% Overall N ^a = 686	% No n = 102	% Yes n = 584	p ^b	Negative /Low vs Positive/ High Valence p ^{b-d}	% Overall N = 756	% LI N = 305	% SC N = 273	% RM N = 178	p ^b
OVERALL WORKING EXPERIENCE WITH sIRB										
Rate your overall experience with the sIRB onboarding process										
Missing	2 (0.3)	0 (0)	2 (0.3)	<.0001	0.001	2 (0.3)	0 (0)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.6)	0.2872
1-Poor	88 (12.8)	10 (9.8)	78 (13.4)			91 (12.0)	43 (14.1)	22 (8.1)	26 (14.6)	
2-Fair	141 (20.6)	12 (11.8)	129 (22.1)			158 (20.9)	66 (21.6)	55 (20.2)	37 (20.8)	
3-Neutral	148 (21.6)	15 (14.7)	133 (22.8)			159 (21.0)	62 (20.3)	57 (20.9)	40 (22.5)	
4-Good	231 (33.7)	40 (39.2)	191 (32.7)			263 (34.8)	98 (32.1)	104 (38.1)	61 (34.3)	
5-Great	76 (11.1)	25 (24.5)	51 (8.7)			83 (11.0)	36 (11.8)	34 (12.5)	13 (7.3)	
Rate your overall experience working with your sIRB or sIRB point of contacts										
Missing	2 (0.3)	1 (1.0)	1 (0.2)	<.0001	<0.001	4 (0.5)	1 (0.33)	2 (0.73)	1 (0.6)	
1-Poor	62 (9.0)	8 (7.8)	54 (9.3)			64 (8.5)	31 (10.2)	18 (6.6)	15 (8.4)	
2-Fair	148 (21.6)	9 (8.8)	139 (23.8)			160 (21.2)	70 (23.0)	56 (20.5)	34 (19.1)	
3-Neutral	131 (19.1)	15 (14.7)	116 (19.9)			149 (19.7)	52 (17.1)	59 (21.6)	38 (21.4)	

4-Good	249 (36.3)	40 (39.2)	209 (35.8)			276 (36.5)	107 (35.1)	97 (35.5)	72 (40.5)	0.5825
5-Great	94 (13.7)	29 (28.4)	65 (11.1)			103 (13.6)	44 (14.4)	41 (15.0)	18 (10.1)	
The new sIRB policy has created difficulty in communication between your team and the sIRB board										
Missing	3 (0.4)	1 (1.0)	2 (0.3)	<.0001	0.001	3 (0.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (1.7)	0.001
1-Strongly Disagree	39 (5.7)	14 (13.7)	25 (4.3)			43 (5.7)	24 (7.9)	11 (4.0)	8 (4.5)	
2-Disagree	193 (28.1)	34 (33.3)	159 (27.2)			207 (27.4)	82 (26.9)	90 (33.0)	35 (19.7)	
3-Neutral	223 (32.5)	36 (35.3)	187 (32.0)			259 (34.3)	101 (33.1)	94 (34.4)	64 (36.0)	
4-Agree	158 (23.0)	9 (8.8)	149 (25.5)			172 (22.8)	62 (20.3)	62 (22.7)	48 (27.0)	
5-Strongly Agree	70 (10.2)	8 (7.8)	62 (10.6)			72 (9.5)	36 (11.8)	16 (5.9)	20 (11.2)	
INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS (ISARs)						STUDY ROLES ^e				
Experiential Questions	% Overall N ^a = 686	% No n = 102	% Yes n = 584	p ^b	Negative /Low vs Positive/ High Valence p ^{b-d}	% Overall N = 756	% LI N = 305	% SC N = 273	% RM N = 178	p ^b
RATINGS OF COST EFFICACY OF sIRB										
The sIRB mechanism is more cost effective than the older site-specific IRB model										
Missing	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.0004	<0.001	2 (0.3)	0 (0)	2 (0.7)	0 (0)	0.0348
1-Strongly Disagree	74 (10.8)	8 (7.8)	66 (11.3)			76 (10.1)	38 (12.5)	18 (6.6)	20 (11.2)	
2-Disagree	103 (15.0)	4 (3.9)	99 (17.0)			106 (14.0)	39 (12.8)	35 (12.8)	32 (18.0)	
3-Neutral	208 (30.3)	37 (36.3)	171 (29.3)			238 (31.5)	83 (27.2)	100 (36.6)	55 (30.9)	
4-Agree	181 (26.4)	24 (23.5)	157 (26.9)			208 (27.5)	87 (28.5)	80 (29.3)	41 (23.0)	
5-Strongly Agree	120 (17.5)	29 (28.4)	91 (15.6)			126 (16.7)	58 (19.0)	38 (13.9)	30 (16.9)	
RATINGS OF TIME AND ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY OF sIRB										
There have been instances where the sIRB did not have the bandwidth, infrastructure, or expertise needed										
Missing	2 (0.3)	2 (2.0)	0 (0)	0.0138	N/A	5 (0.7)	1 (0.3)	2 (0.7)	2 (1.1)	0.2234
1-Strongly Disagree	91 (13.3)	18 (17.7)	73 (12.5)			96 (12.7)	45 (14.8)	33 (12.1)	18 (10.1)	
2-Disagree	238 (34.7)	31 (30.4)	207 (35.5)			258 (34.1)	95 (31.2)	97 (35.5)	66 (37.1)	
3-Neutral	166 (24.2)	26 (25.5)	140 (24.0)			189 (25.0)	66 (21.6)	75 (27.5)	48 (27.0)	
4-Agree	136 (19.8)	18 (17.7)	118 (20.2)			152 (20.1)	67 (22.0)	51 (18.7)	34 (19.1)	
5-Strongly Agree	53 (7.7)	7 (6.9)	46 (7.9)			56 (7.4)	31 (10.2)	15 (5.5)	10 (5.6)	
I have faced challenges with timelines while working with a sIRB										
Missing	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)			0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	

1-Never	64 (9.3)	23 (22.6)	41 (7.0)	<.0001	<0.001	74 (9.8)	25 (8.2)	34 (12.5)	15 (8.4)	0.012
2-Occasionally	188 (27.4)	41 (40.2)	147 (25.2)			206 (27.3)	72 (23.6)	74 (27.1)	60 (33.7)	
3-Sometimes	208 (30.3)	16 (15.7)	192 (32.9)			227 (30.0)	90 (29.5)	87 (31.9)	50 (28.1)	
4-Usually	147 (21.4)	12 (11.8)	135 (23.1)			163 (21.6)	68 (22.3)	58 (21.3)	37 (20.8)	
5-Always	79 (11.5)	10 (9.8)	69 (11.8)			86 (11.4)	50 (16.4)	20 (7.3)	16 (9.0)	

	INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS (ISARs)					STUDY ROLES ^e				
Experiential Questions	% Overall N ^a = 686	% No n = 102	% Yes n = 584	p ^b	Negative/ Low vs Positive/ High Valence p ^{b-d}	% Overall N = 756	% LI N = 305	% SC N = 273	% RM N = 178	p ^b

RATINGS OF TIME AND ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY OF sIRB

Rate the time required for your local sIRB review/approval

Missing	4 (0.6)	2 (2.0)	2 (0.3)	<.0001	<0.001	5 (0.7)	0 (0)	3 (1.1)	2 (1.1)	0.0304
1-Poor	108 (15.7)	15 (14.7)	93 (15.9)			115 (15.2)	59 (19.3)	36 (13.9)	20 (11.2)	
2-Fair	153 (22.3)	5 (4.9)	148 (25.3)			177 (23.4)	81 (26.6)	56 (20.5)	40 (22.5)	
3-Neutral	156 (22.7)	25 (24.5)	131 (22.4)			170 (22.5)	67 (22.0)	64 (23.4)	39 (21.9)	
4-Good	210 (30.6)	33 (32.4)	177 (30.3)			227 (30.0)	75 (24.6)	95 (34.8)	57 (32.0)	
5-Great	55 (8.0)	22 (21.6)	33 (5.7)			62 (8.2)	23 (7.5)	19 (7.0)	20 (11.2)	

The sIRB mandate hampers the review process due to local regulatory, ethnic, and cultural variations

Missing	2 (0.3)	1 (1.0)	1 (0.2)	0.0097	<0.001	3 (0.4)	1 (0.3)	2 (0.7)	0 (0)	0.0054
1-Strongly Disagree	39 (5.7)	10 (9.8)	29 (5.0)			42 (5.6)	27 (8.9)	9 (3.3)	6 (3.4)	
2-Disagree	210 (30.6)	40 (39.2)	170 (29.1)			227 (30.0)	85 (27.9)	95 (34.8)	47 (26.4)	
3-Neutral	227 (33.1)	31 (30.4)	196 (33.6)			264 (34.9)	99 (32.5)	102 (37.4)	63 (35.4)	
4-Agree	139 (20.3)	10 (9.8)	129 (22.1)			149 (19.7)	62 (20.3)	50 (18.3)	37 (20.8)	
5-Strongly Agree	69 (10.1)	10 (9.9)	59 (10.1)			71 (9.4)	31 (10.2)	15 (5.5)	25 (14.0)	

Rate how the sIRB process has affected your administrative burden

Missing	2 (0.3)	1 (1.0)	1 (0.2)	0.0009	<0.001	4 (0.5)	0 (0)	1 (0.4)	3 (1.7)	0.0016
1-Significantly Reduced	62 (9.0)	14 (13.7)	48 (8.2)			65 (8.6)	26 (8.5)	20 (7.3)	19 (10.7)	
2-Slightly Reduced	122 (17.8)	20 (19.6)	102 (17.5)			131 (17.3)	47 (15.4)	53 (19.4)	31 (17.4)	
3-Neutral	171 (24.9)	37 (36.3)	134 (23.0)			202 (26.7)	82 (26.9)	89 (32.6)	31 (17.4)	
4-Slightly Increased	177 (25.8)	13 (12.8)	164 (28.1)			194 (25.7)	77 (25.3)	71 (26.0)	46 (25.8)	
5-Significantly Increased	152 (22.2)	17 (16.7)	135 (23.1)			160 (21.7)	73 (23.9)	39 (14.3)	48 (27.0)	

^a 70 surveys that did not answer the question on if they had an institution-specific application requirement were excluded.

^b Missing values excluded from statistical testing.

^c Post-hoc pairwise comparisons between negative/low and positive/high valence responses were performed for responses with significant group differences among negative/low, neutral, and positive/high responses.

^d Negative/low valence responses refer to "Strongly Disagree/Disagree," "Never," "Poor/Fair," or "Significantly/Slightly Reduced" and positive/high valence responses refer to "Agree/Strongly Agree," "Usually/Always," "Good/Great," or "Significantly/Slightly Increased."

^e LI = leading investigator, SC = study coordinator, RM = regulatory manager.