You are the head of the human subject research review board (IRB) at your medical center. Before physicians and scientists can carry out research on human subjects, they need approval from the IRB. The IRB determines if the proposed research is important and if it has a high likelihood of advancing our knowledge. The IRB also judges whether the risks to the human subjects are justified by the potential benefits of the proposed work either to the subjects themselves or to future patients. In addition, the IRB tries to insure that the humans who agree to be experimental subjects understand the risks of participating in the research compared to the benefits that they might receive.

One of the scientists at your medical center has proposed to carry out research on a new type of artificial blood that might save many lives. Preliminary investigation with animals has shown that the artificial blood should be safe for humans. The scientist who proposes the research with human subjects also owns the company that makes the artificial blood product. If she discovers the product works for humans, then her company will make a lot of money. If she discovers that the product does not work in humans, then her company will lose a lot of money. Some of your IRB board members have argued that because of her financial involvement, she will be unable to carry out the research completely honestly, even if she tries to do so. Other board members have argued that she is the best qualified person to carry out the research because she understands the artificial blood product better than anyone else. As head of the IRB, would you allow her to carry out this research? If so, would you establish any special conditions under which the research must be done? If not, would you propose any alternatives?

Dear Students,

Thank your for your thoughtful and interesting responses. We received comments from 177 individuals representing 21 schools. Your ideas were excellent. You emphasized that the human subjects involved should fully understand the research. A majority of you felt that the researcher could do the work despite her financial interests if the research was monitored in an appropriate fashion.

A major goal of health research is to increase the availability of safe, lifesaving treatments. It concerns us, however, when the outcome of research to evaluate these treatments might be influenced by financial interests. Such is the conflict in our dilemma where the person who wants to do the research also is the person most closely linked to the financial interests. We call this situation a “conflict of interest.” Ideally, a researcher working with human subjects should be interested in helping patients directly or in generating scientific findings to help future patients. In our dilemma, however, besides helping patients, the researcher stands to gain or lose financially depending on the results of the experiments.

Researchers need to be intellectually honest and neutral about the results of their findings. Many people are concerned that financial interests can influence a researcher’s judgment, not only causing bias in study design and data analysis, but also in the selection or use of patients as human subjects. Consequently, organizations such as the American Association of Medical Colleges recommend that except under special circumstances researchers should not participate in human research if they have a significant financial interest in the outcome. In our dilemma, however, besides helping patients, the researcher stands to gain or lose financially depending on the results of the experiments.

Several different mechanisms help protect the integrity of the research even when a conflict of interest is present. First, testing the usefulness of new treatments usually depends on the results of multiple studies at multiple locations. Therefore, a single person can have only limited impact on the final outcome of the evaluation. Second, the design of the research will have to be approved in advance not only by the medical center’s institutional review board, but also eventually by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FDA approval is required before a new drug can become available for regular use. Once the research design has been established, the investigators cannot make any changes without FDA approval. Third, the research can include participation of a data research and monitoring board to oversee every aspect of the studies from selection of patients to analysis of the data. With these safeguards in place, the IRB would likely approve the research described in our ethics dilemma.
Yes, I would let the scientist carry out her research. Preliminary investigation shows this blood should be safe for humans, so it definitely warrants further experimentation. As the owner of the company who makes this artificial blood, she does have a lot to gain. On the other hand, she could also lose a lot of money if the product does not work on humans. Some of the IRB board members' concerns are understandable, but if the board is carried out like it should be, her company and work ethics should be under review throughout the whole research process. This sounds like a risk worthy of participation. After all, the potential of many lives saved is a benefit to society at large. She is the best qualified person and understands the product better than anyone else. If she is working on something of this magnitude for the human race, she obviously cares and is not in it for just the monetary gain. She is well aware of the IRB's influence and the need for their approval and scrutiny of the project. Because of this, I believe she is working in the best interest of humanity, while at the same time striving to better her company and self.

RH
DBU
6/24/04

Definitely a scenario that could produce 2 reasonably correct answers. I believe that the lady should be allowed to perform her research and long as it is understood that all results would be scrutinized by a board who has been hand picked by the research staff to do an analysis of the development and also to verify the testing procedures. What if she also had a position where she would just head-up the development team and not actually do any hands on work. If she is not allowed to participate would it be possible that the development of this drug could be delayed for months or even years, and the chance to save hundreds of lives would be lost. I say we let her do her research with the aid of a team.

B.E.H.
Dallas Baptist University
4/4/04

Personally, I would allow the scientist to carry out the research on humans because there is a real blood shortage right now. If the research was to be done, I would only allow it every 1 out of 4 patients that need a blood transfusion.

J.A.M.
Socorro High School
3/31/04

As head of IRB, I would allow her to carry out her research because if she is successful then many lives could be saved. Blood transfusions may take a while because of the person's blood type but this way that person can get the blood transfusion right away. As long as she knows what she is doing and the possible risks then let her do her research. I believe she should be under supervision of another scientist that has no beneficial outcome of this research who understands what she is doing. Yeah she may become rich but at the same time they have to look at the outcome of her research and the benefits.

E.P.H.
Socorro High School
3/30/04

I believe the most qualified people should be able to do what they are good at; in this case the scientist is considered the best in her field for this type of research. However, because she would benefit financially from a positive result in the experiment, I believe it might sway her judgement, as with any other person. To prevent this, she should be overseen by someone or a group of people who wouldn't benefit financially from this experiment. This would allow her to do her job, possibly gain some money, and everyone involved would be assured that the results are true.

S.K.
Arbor Creek Middle School

3/30/04

I believe that the scientist should be able to perform the experimentation herself. However, an outside, neutral party that will not benefit from the experiments financially should work closely with her and be allowed all of the same privileges when it comes to monitoring the experiments as she is. That way, a close objective eye can be on all of the information all of the time, and hopefully, this will prevent any doctoring of the data.

VLA
Socorro High School

3/29/04

I believe that people are making this a bigger deal than it is. A woman is trying to help the world, and they are arguing over if it is wrong or right. She is using her own money for this project, so they should be completely up for it. By her doing that it shows that she has almost full confidence in herself. Which is more than a lot of other people would be willing to risk. I think that it is horrible that money is the issue here. Are these people saying that money is more important that saving lives and helping the world? By them arguing about this they are just killing more and more people. It's going to take time so they need to start right away. I would just say forget the money and go for it!

E.C.
Fossil Ridge High School

3/29/04

I would of course allow her to carry out the research, especially if she understands the artificial blood more than anyone else. I would, however, suggest that another scientist who is also a leading authority on artificial blood who has no financial involvement in the research assist in the research so that they can give an objective opinion on whether or not the artificial blood works and is safe.

JRC
Socorro High School

3/27/04

I think the fact that she owns the company sponsoring the research should not matter. The fact that she is gambling her own money should be proof enough that all of her effort will be put into the project. If her company's past research shows no sign of personal involvement interfering with their research, then I feel she should be allowed to carry out the assignment.

N.S.
Arbor Creek

3/27/04

I believe that the scientist should be allowed to test the new artificial blood because she understands it better than anyone else. I think that there should be no special conditions under which the research should be done. I think that it is a bonus that she has something to gain from the product's success because she will be more motivated to make the tests a success.
As the head of the IRB, I feel it is important that a level of trust is maintained between scientists, however, this is a matter of special attention. Yes, I would allow this scientist to perform her research under the conditions that any other experiment would be performed, and her findings would be reviewed and analyzed normally. But, a duplicate experiment would be carried out by an independent scientist, and those results would be reviewed and analyzed. If, however, an anomaly was discovered between the data from the two experiments, then the proposal would be placed under investigation, and, if needed, rejection. The cost of conducting a repeat experiment would be well worth the lives and careers at risk.

M.C.
Fossil Ridge High School
3/25/04

The only issue here worth debating is the idea that the scientist has a conflict of interest in the eyes of some members of the IRB. For those that feel that she will be unable to carry out the research honestly, review the previous record of this scientist and ask these questions: Has she been known to maintain ethical practices in previous experiments? Or is she known to be irresponsible with her specimens? And most importantly, how much risk is involved with this experiment? According to the information provided in the case, the artificial blood "should" be safe for humans. Using the word "should" casts doubt into my mind on the legitimacy of her product and I believe that whenever you test humans you should be almost "certain" that the product will not harm the human. After all, this is a life or death situation because we all know that you cannot survive without blood. So examine the scientist's record, it could help determine the answer to this question.

Z.H.
Frisco High School
3/25/04

I believe that being the most qualified person, the scientist should be allowed to carry out her experimentation with the artificial blood but should have limitations that are to be placed by the IRB. The limitations will involve which type of animals, including humans, she can perform her tests on. Also, There should be a couple of highly qualified scientists appointed from outside her facility supervising and possibly assisting in her studies. This will allow for a honest outcome of the results without tainting or possibly halting the breakthrough of artificial blood.

C.G.
Frisco High School
3/25/04

As head of the IRB review board, I would allow the scientist to conduct the artificial blood experiments, but also carefully observe the project to ensure honesty is kept & that no lives are in danger.

EG
Harwood Junior High School
3/25/04

As head of the IRB, I would allow the woman to proceed with the research only if she agreed to provide clear documentation and proper support of her findings. I would be more comfortable with the situation if she continued to test the artificial blood on animals with circulatory systems similar to those of humans. Ideally, humans would be eased into the process with only small amounts of the artificial blood being introduced into their systems; nothing drastic like a transfusion. I believe that with such strict accountability to the IRB, her financial zeal may be subdued. Also, since the IRB and ultimately the government authorities would be skeptical of her objectivity, she would be forced to show accuracy.
If this person is the most qualified to carry out the experiment, then I think she should be allowed to do so. Another person that is equally knowledgable about the experiment should also go along with her so if she does have motive to be dishonest about the product then there will be someone to catch her before it is released on humans other than the research subjects. If there is some dishonesty when a faulty product is released and she does so for her personal gain, then she, in turn, will also be getting sued for unhappy patients. I do believe that if this experiment will be beneficial in saving thousands of lives then it is worth the risk and the time of this scientist.

Katie McGhee
Frisco High School
3/25/04

Well I think that she should not do the research because if she is not sure that the blood well save peoples lives then they will lose alot of money. But my opinion would be different if she did know what was going on and if she knew if it really worked

A.G.
Arlington High School
3/25/04

I think that since this woman is a professional in the field, I would allow her to continue the research. I would personally set certain guidelines to which the woman would have to follow ,and keep evaluating her performance. Since she is involved in this matter financially, she will succeed if she helps the community and because she is putting her money in it too , she would loose it if it failed.

KR
Arlington High School
3/25/04

I agree that she should carry out the experiment, because she is most qualified. But she is also financially involved so i would want someone to supervise her in continuing the experiment out.

AR
Arlington High
3/25/04

I agree that she is the most qualified to perfor the experiments, but she is also financially involved, so I would allow her to carry out her experiments but I would send someone to supervise. Someone who is not involved emotionally or financially and have them just make sure that everything was fair and honest.

RB
Arlington High School
3/25/04

Well, I think it is a good idea so that way people dont have to wait to much for get blood.

V.A.
Arlington High School
3/25/04

I would dffinately allow the scientist at the center to go through with the artificial blood transfer. Since she had been working with the blood for so long she probably inunderstands it better than any other person there. The researcher is risking a lot of money and i think she would not risk the chance if she wasn't sincere. The
A researcher is willing to do this so most likely she really wants to help people. If the blood does work she will gain a lot of money but the results will be even better.

A.W.  
Arlington High School  
3/25/04

I think this is a very important discovery for the medical field. Since that sexual diseases can transfer through the Blood Transfusion, I think we should be more concern about this problem. If this woman can really provide this artificial blood product, the doctors need to try to do a experience on it, to be able to see if it really works, or if it will do anything harmful to humans.

YC  
Arlington High School  
3/25/04

Being the head of IRB I would allow the business woman to continue her research, yet under the close watch of another trusted, mutual board member. In addition, if this businesswoman was not allowed to research in the field she knows best this would be a crime to the medical field.

S.H.  
Arlington High  
3/25/04

I would let her proceed with the experiment. Even though she does not have any money, she is the best qualified. I believe that she will get the job done and earn herself a lot of money. I would set up special conditions for her to do the research. The special conditions would be away from the public and somewhere top secret. If she is a failure, I don't want other people to know about it. I would ruin everything of her. I strongly believe that she will be able to pull through. Who knows, maybe the money reward will be a good boost to get the job done. If she is the best one for this job, she will get it done. I have faith in her. As the head of the IRB, I will let her proceed with this research.

3/25/04

If I was the head of the research department I wouldn't want that done. I mean I know we could learn a lot from it but there's human lives at stake. People say 'Ya ok ill b ur testing human but no one really knows what's gonna happen and people don't always know what's best; what if something were to go wrong and the human subjects were to die or have horrible problems? Artificial blood is not made for the human body. That's why we have real blood and have blood drives. Cuz that's how we were made and there's no reason to try to change it.

CN  
Arlington High School  
3/25/04

I believe that she should be able to carry out the procedure; she is a professional and would not subject human lives just for the fact that it would make her company a lot of money. Money is important but being professional she would care more about the lives and safety of human beings. Just in case, she could also have other medically smart people working with her that aren't from her company to make sure it does what she says it does. It could possibly save many lives if the experiment works.

K.P.  
Arlington High School  
3/25/04

I would continue the preliminary research with more animals to verify the artificial blood is as safe as possible for human testing. Since she is possibly the most qualified person to conduct the research, a group of respected peers should work alongside her in administering the tests so that she can still be involved with the project while dissolving any suspicions regarding the integrity of her results. The amount of artificial blood...
should be injected in incremental amounts so that any side effects might be observed early on and prevent any serious injuries or reactions.

G.M.
Frisco High School
3/24/04

I would consent to letting her carry this experiment out. Though she may lose money, there is always the chance that she could end up not only gaining money but also saving other people's lives. After all of her research and time dedicated to this proposal, she could more than likely carry this procedure out better than anyone else. And if she is unsuccessful, her work may lead to a breakthrough in the future. Losing money now is worth it if it will save lives in the future.

MH
Arlington High
3/24/04

I personally believe that there is absolutely no way that she could carry out a completely non-biased study. No matter what, she will want that money, and she will always lean toward passing the artificial blood rather than an indifferent approach. They should let her still be involved, but not as the head of the research. That way, the research that is done will be unbiased and everyone can get the real truth about how the blood works.

JP
Arlington High School
3/24/04

I would not allow her to carry out this research but if I truly believed that she was the best qualified person to carry out the research then I would hire someone to watch over her moves 24/7.

3/24/04

I would allow the scientists to carry out her research. If this scientist must know what she is doing if she is willing to do this on humans. I think that in the medical field some times we have to take financial risk to try and help save lives. I would not establish any special conditions. The only alternative would be if within a year or so if there was no improvement in her research then to drop it.

RD
Arlington High School
3/24/04

I think this would be a big medical breakthrough that could save many lives. It would reduce a lot of the danger that comes with receiving blood transfusions. Therefore, I would let this scientist carry out the research because she is the most qualified person for this project. To make sure that the research is carried out honestly, I would require daily progress reports and have a supervisor above her. This way I think this project could be done more effectively.

G.S
Arlington High School
3/24/04

I think the scientist should go through with the artificial blood experiment. The research to her is the most understandable. Despite the financial problems, the chance of letting her do the research shows the she is responsible and able enough to go on with the research. Artificial blood could save many peoples lives.

KF
Arlington High School
3/24/04

I think the researcher should be allowed to continue her research on artificial blood. The outcome could be beneficial to many people. If a universal blood could be found there would not be a shortage on rare blood types. I would however, have someone else monitor the progress of her research. If she is the one funding the project, she could alter the records in order to make money and not have the greater good of the people in mind. If someone monitors her work then there is less migraine for error.

LC
Arlington High School
3/24/04

As head of the IRB review board, I would allow the scientist to conduct the artificial blood experiments, but also carefully observe the project to ensure honesty is kept & that no lives are in danger.

EG
Harwood Junior High school
3/24/04

I would allow the scientist to carry out her research. Choosing her for the research seems to be the best solution. She understands the experiment with artificial blood the best. Choosing her would be a risk due to her financial situations; however taking this risk would be one I would be willing to take. If her experiments are successful then this could save millions of lives and it would help her company.

MT
Arlington High School
3/24/04

Although the woman could stand to gain a considerable amount of profit from the artificial blood if it is a success, i believe this risky research could be beneficial to many lives. This research could lead to a getaway of other life-saving breakthroughs if it is given a chance.

KH
Arlington High School
3/24/04

I think that the scientist should be allowed to carry out the research if it could end up saving peoples lives. One of the research conditions should be another scientist watching over her work and procedures to make sure she is properly using it as it should be used. She should also test the new artificial blood on humans to make sure that it works as it should and that is completely safe and will cause no harm.

A.F.
Arlington High School
3/24/04

My reaction toward letting this woman show some sort of medial break though on artificial blood is yes. I think I would let her show her potential well being to a factor that could save many lives in the future even though it was a financial risk. It is a risk worth taking to probably saving many lives in the near future of the experiment is continued.

AM
Arlington High School
I would allow this scientist at the medical center to carry out the artificial blood experiment. Throughout her research, it seems that she understands the research more than anyone else working on this, so she is best qualified to decide whether or not this would work with humans. If this is successful, which she seems sure of, then the company will earn a lot of money. Some conditions the research would have to be done under are close research over and over to make sure the artificial blood is successful, as well as find a human to test this product on. Proceeding with this experiment would help out the company which is why they should allow this experiment to continue.

L.F.
Lake Highlands Freshman Center

I think that the scientist should be allowed to carry out the research. She probably knows more about artificial blood than any other person in her field because of her experience with her company. Also she will probably be more persevered toward the research because of her personal gain. If she does poorly than she would lose a lot of money.

R.A.
Arbor Creek

If I had a part in the IRB, I would consider this a hard decision because the researcher is risking her own money and success. She might, therefore, be completely biased. However, this research is very important and would give scientists the opportunity to save thousands of lives. I would allow the researcher to continue the study under another equally knowledgeable person that is not partial to either outcome and not a part of the company. In research it is crucial that all participants and executors remain unbiased so that the results may be taken seriously to advance science.

M.B.
Frisco High School

I think that it would be unethical to let her carry out her experiment, due to her financial arrangement in this case. She then could alter the experiment to make her company sell the artificial blood, thus making her more wealthy.

I would permit this particular scientist to research and experiment on artificial blood. Since this person makes a career out of researching artificial blood, I would grant this person my permission because it sounds like that is her expertise. If this was not the case however, and the scientist had not majored in the field of artificial blood I would then be somewhat reluctant to the experiment. Artificial blood could be a great discovery in the medical field and it may help millions of people if the experiment works. I understand that it may take a great amount of money on the issue but if she is willing to take a chance on something she has made a career out of then I give her my consent. All the scientist has to do is get a volunteer that is willing to be the "experiment".

L.E.
Fossil Ridge High School

I think that the research could prove invaluable so she should be allowed to continue her research under the supervision of an appointed specialist. The specialist should be an independent research who works outside her company that way any misconduct on her part can be reported back to the IRB. This compromise allows her research to go forward based on the improvements it could make in society on not for the experimentor's
I think they should let the scientist test the artificial blood on herself while being supervised by another person, so that they wouldn't think she was lying just to get the money. I think she is doing a good thing trying to save millions of lives. I think we should appreciate her for trying something somebody else wouldn't have done and I don't think we should think she would do something negative because she is doing something positive. I think no matter what she would be honest. But I also think it would be hard to carry it out.

CS
Arlington High School
3/23/04

I do not think I would let her do it because she already is not financially stable. She could get more money if it works but if it doesn't then she is out of money. She needs to think about the pros and cons before she even tries to start this experiment. It would be a good thing maybe but she needs to find out the whole information first. She would be putting others at risk by not knowing all the facts. Maybe she could wait until she gets more money saved for projects to start the whole process.

KU
Arlington High School
3/23/04

I think that the scientist who proposed to carry out the research on artificial blood for humans should not be allowed to. The financial problem is why I disagree. If they can get the money that's needed then I would reconsider. Also, there are risks involved if the project doesn't work like expected. I think the scientist needs to be positive about her plan before she considers beginning. Ethically, the project doesn't seem reasonable to consider testing.

L. R.
Arlington High School
3/23/04

I believe that her opinion would be biased due to her financial involvement in the case. Therefore, I believe that it is unethical to have her participate and or head the research process.

NW
Arlington High School
3/22/04

As head of the IRB, I would allow the scientist to carry out the research because she has the best knowledge of the artificial blood product than other scientists. Even for the financial problems, I would take the risk in letting her do the research if she proves to be responsible and honest enough to carry out this research, but with proper funding. I personally think that artificial blood would save lots of people lives in this world, and we should take the risk to make this happen; but before we test it on humans, we should test it on animals first and see what the results might be, and if it works; I think she should go for it.

A. C.
Frisco High School
Don’t most research laboratories produce and test out procedures or drugs that they will eventually use to sell for profit? To me, this seems like a standard practice among most companies, however, we must not always take only one party’s word. Before proceeding with putting the blood into humans, similar tests by other companies or independent entities must be conducted since artificial blood transfusions are incredibly risky experiments. If the results turn out to parallel the scientists original conclusions, then she may proceed with human experimentation while other scientists do the same to make sure that the results are 100% accurate.

A.E.M.
Frisco High School

I would let her work as the head of the research because she knows the most about the artificial blood. I don’t think she would be dishonest, because the blood will have to work with humans for her company to get any money. Also it will help out with the people who need the blood.

K.R.
LHFC

I believe the owner of the company should be allowed to have the artificial blood tested on herself but I don’t think she should be in charge or know the results until the end of all experimentation. Either that of she should have someone else test it on themselves and be in charge. I don’t think she can handle both responsibilities although I believe she will be honest in whichever one she does.

A.C.
Lake Highlands Freshman Center

I would allow her to work on the case because she is one of the best qualified scientist. She should be kept under strong supervision by other experts in order to control some of the research. Under some circumstances, the artificial blood may serve as a last resort and this would offer an opportunity to test its effectiveness by the new scientist. If she seems she can take the responsibility of testing the products then I think you should let her and see what results come back from her experiments.

M.H.
LHFC

I believe that the scientist should be able to carry out the research for on artificial blood. If the product is successful, then it can make major improvements is today's medical world; people needing immediate blood transfusions would have faster blood access (no need to wait for a donor with the same type of blood). Artificial blood would also diminish if not erase, the small percentage of people that get infected with diseases through blood transfusions because artificial blood is prefabricated and one would know exactly where that blood came from. The only conditions that might be put on the scientists is that the subjects themselves are well aware of what they are participating in and have understood and agreed to what they would be submitting themselves to. Of course, if immediate dangers arise after research has begun, the research would have to be undoubtedly stopped. The scientist, also, should be well aware of her loss in case the research does not come out as expected.

L.L.
Socorro High School
An artificial blood would of course be beneficial to the medical field. The most knowledgeable person in this particular field proposes that research be done on human subjects. She also happens to own the company who would produce it and gain profit. Should we let her run this research? Yes, she is the most knowledgeable - No, she will alter the results for financial gain. It could be either because now we're questioning human integrity. Is the average human on this planet honest? How far will the average person go to make money? I don't know the answers to these questions. We can make some inferences about her character though.

The person we are discussing is working to revolutionize an aspect of medicine (already not the average person). She probably went to college and medical school to learn information which has already been discovered, and she has made her own discoveries which might be taught to college and medical students in the future. She could have been in charge of the successful animal tests. These few inferences display the characteristics of determination, intelligence, reliability, and an interest in science. A person with all these qualities, in my opinion, has an integrity level higher than that of the average person. With integrity comes honesty. Theoretically, as the head of the IRB, I would allow her to carry out this research because of her background. This isn't a strong reason, but given the limited information about her character, it is the strongest reason I can think of.

If I actually was the head of the IRB this would require some more deliberation because people do unexpected things, especially for money. There could be multiple alternatives or special conditions in which the research could be conducted, but that is an ethics case in itself.

W.Z.N.
Lake Highlands Freshman Center
3/18/04

This discussion is confused. Any sort of new agent proposed for medical use probably was developed by someone who has something to gain from its use, or else nothing would motivate them to develop the product. Therefore no special conditions exist for this scientist. As for the human test subjects, the authorities, quite fallible themselves, must validate such judgements as test safety no matter the scientist before testing. Lastly, teams of scientists, not just one, perform experiments, so the risk of this speculatory 'funny business' is largely imagined. The doctor should continue to lead the experiments.

MCM
STHSP
3/18/04

As the head of the IRB, I would not let the woman continue until she explained to me how the artificial blood works. But yes, if I completely understood the blood, I would allow her to carry out her study and research and provide proper funding.

C. H.
Lake Highlands Freshman Center
3/18/04

I would let her continue the research because it is for a good cause, saving lives, she would just be supervised and made sure that everything was done in a correct manner.

D.A.
MED-HIGH
3/18/04

Although the artificial blood sounds intriguing enough, personally I don't consider it one of the greatest milestones in medical breakthroughs as it has been presented. The case stated that it "should" be safe for humans. That did not sway me in any way to support it-sounding as if the research is highly debatable and has not undergone enough testing. Also considering the fact that the main researcher is also the founder, I
would have to disapprove of the testing or require a research team that was in no way affiliated with the founder.

J.M.
Med-High
3/14/04

As head of the IRB board I would allow her to continue and do SOME of the research, but under some limitations. Since she is the one with the most knowledge about the artificial blood.

3/13/04

I would allow her to work on the case because she is one of the best qualified but I would keep her under strong supervision by allowing other experts to control some of the research also.

M.H.
3/12/04

I think that the scientist should be able to test her product on herself. I do not think that it would be hard for her to carry out this test honestly. She is the best person to test this on because she knows everything about the product including its side effects. Also if it is tested on her and something bad happens then no innocent people will get hurt. However I do believe that one of her colleagues should be in control of the test. Another person should be in charge of collecting data and recording the results. Because although she might want to be honest since she has spent so much time and money into this product; accordingly, she might be tempted to tamper or manipulate the results and data of the experiment.

A.M.
FRISCO HIGH SCHOOL
3/11/04

As head of the IRB, I believe that this research would be critical in saving the lives of many people who suffer blood disorders, severe injuries, and would lessen the need for mass blood donations. This new technology would enable doctors to administer 100% pure, uncontaminated blood to people to whom it would mean life or death. Moreover, I believe that although this scientist also owns the company in which she is researching for, she would indeed be the most qualified individual to head up the project. Like anyone, though, the ethical line between success and harm is fine, and no one should be burdened completely with that role. A committee of qualified individuals should also be overseeing all of her progress and experiments. With capable peers, this scientist would be able to make sound ethical decisions, promote medical science, and make a little money on the side as well.

A. G.
Frisco High School
3/11/04

As head of the Human Subject Research Review board (IRB) I would approve of the scientist proceeding with her study on artificial blood because, the research is assuring that this woman's far reaching background in this field should certainly be able to implement her research. When testing on humans there should be two separate tests implemented, one being the actual research that she is doing on the blood with human beings, two being a false testing on the blood with human beings so that at the conclusion of the testing results of both tests may be weighed for validity.

B.
Euless Jr. High
3/11/04

I think that the scientist should be able to test the product on them. She knows the most about it and if something bad happens, no innocent people will get hurt. However since it is her product there should be someone there to take the results and data. The person to conduct the experiment should be unbiased but
they should know something about the product. I believe that someone should be there because the scientist might want her product to work so bad that she might manipulate the data or results.

A.M.  
FRISCO HIGH SCHOOL  
3/9/04

As head of the Human Subject Research review board (IRB) I would approve of the scientist proceeding with her study on artificial blood. However, I think that before human subjects are used in the study, a separate trial should be run in another lab to verify her preliminary results. The results from a lab that is less financially involved should be compared to the results from the scientist whose company will benefit from this medical breakthrough. To encourage full cooperation, an agreement should be signed by all parties that patent rights remain with the original research company and the company verifying the data will not sell the idea or use the research information for their own monetary gain. To further prevent bias and ensure objectivity, a committee from the IRB, including myself should review the data and be present during the first testing of human subjects.

B. I. A.  
Trinidad High School  
3/9/04

I think that because the research is promising and this particular woman has an in depth background in the field she should certainly be allowed to carry out the research. If the scientist is the most qualified and could conduct the best research, there should be no doubt she is the best suited for the position. Donating blood is great, and it is proven to help those in need, but if this woman has the ability to make an artificial blood that is proven successful with animals and promises the same on humans, she should be granted the ability to research and develop. Since the scientist is linked with the company there would probably be some question of scandalous activity, but overall I think it wouldn’t be a problem. I don’t think any real precautions would have to be taken, but to make everyone happy, there would probably have to be some sort of supervision or a check system. The scientist would probably have to present her work and an in depth analysis of her findings every week or so, just to make sure the funding was being used properly.

A.C.  
Frisco High School  
3/8/04

The potential medical benefits of this product are too important to not condone moving forward with human subject testing. However, the financial bias of the woman in charge could prejudice the results of the experiment. Therefore, I would propose that she assemble a RD team to work cooperatively with a RD team assembled by the IRB. With a larger group of experimenters it will not only serve to keep everyone honest, with so many others looking over their shoulder, but also allow the study of larger sample groups so that testing may be done with more statistically reliable results. Her colleagues will be able to gather their information and take their cues from her so the program will benefit from her knowledge, and the IRB will have people in place to ensure that everything is carried out in the manner prescribed by the collaborative efforts of the two teams. The subjects must be completely knowledgeable of the risks involved in the experiment but must remain blind to which team(s) they are being tested under, in order to prevent prejudice against them.

3/7/04

I believe that this research is valid and has the potential to save many lives. Because of her experience on the subject I would allow the head scientist who was working on the project to continue because she had the most knowledge of the subject and would be the most qualified to test and research it. However, because of her personal interests in the matter I would assume that she might be tempted to ‘smudge’ the results in her favor, therefore I would appoint someone who had no connection to that particular scientist, or the company she worked for to assist her and document all of their experiments, findings, etc... I would also request to see all of their findings and ‘check up’ on everything that they were doing to make sure that everything was legitimate and that there was no 'funny business'.

As the head of the IRB, I would allow her to carry out her research. She should get to because she is the best person to conduct the research. Also, the potential benefits from the research are much greater than the risks. Artificial blood could help thousands of people in the future compared to hurting a few number of people in a test group. It would not be justified to not try at all. I mean, if they don't even try than how are we going to ever know if it would have really worked or not. If it works for animals and is completely safe for them, then I think the artificial blood product would also work for humans. Although, she knows the most about this product, I would hire someone just as capable and experienced as her to work along side her. This scientist could check her work for mistakes and give me reports on the research.

N.S.
SHS
3/7/04

I would allow the scientist to head up the research on the human subjects under the condition that she appoint other scientists to administer the tests and record the data and results in concurrence with the IRB's own appointees to the project. No one that is personally or financially invested in research this important or with this much money to gain can be solely appointed to the task because of their bias and possibly too strong an urge to succeed. I question the ethics of the head of the company, and therefore would want someone I trusted working along with her trustees as a precautionary measure to assure that the research was properly, safely, objectively, and legitimately carried out.

3/7/04

I feel that the benefits of this research would revolutionize medicine and save countless lives if it was able to reach the field. I think that if I were the head of the IRB I would take all of the options into consideration but I would ultimately let it progress into human testing under an unreal amount of scrutiny and require a lot of test subjects before it was officially deemed absolutely safe. I would realize that her financial involvement and her expertise would clash in the minds of the board and that is why I would demand constant monitoring for all cases. I would have to be completely sure that the work was done right and nothing was doctored that would allow for untruthful results. If more than a certain percentage of the test subjects in the study were negatively affected by the substance, I would stop the study and have them take their product out of the human stage of testing. I feel that if it could end up helping countless numbers of people then the human stage of testing must be entered under very tight reins. I am a firm believer in advancements that could benefit patients as much as this could.

J.V.W.
Southwest High School
3/7/04

As head of the IRB, I would allow this scientist to carry out her research because this study could be very beneficial to saving the lives of many humans. I think she should be able to be head of this study because she shows that she is the most qualified for the position, but she shouldn't have all the control in it. I would send one of my colleagues to assist her in the research. My colleague will give me a detail report on everything that happens, so that the scientist doesn't give any false information. We never know she might just be in this for the money not caring what symptoms might come out of using it in humans.

E.H.
SHS
As heads of the IRB we have come to a conclusion involving the case of whether or not to allow a top researcher in the field of artificial blood to conduct her research regardless of her fiscal involvement, because of the impact it would have on society. To see that she carries this out honestly and too the best of her ability we will set up some special criteria that she must meet. First, she must combine employees from her company and our IRB board that are well versed in the area of artificial blood to work together to get the job done. Second, she must be willing to subject herself to random evaluations and deadlines. However, the deadlines will depend solely on the extenuating circumstances. When the evaluations are made, the deadlines will be assessed simply to see that all research is conducted honestly, and funding is not being taken advantage of. Finally, when the final deadline for cease of funding is reached we will asses the progress one last time to see if it would be in our best interest and the interest of the general populace to continue funding her research.

RR, RP and BB
Mineral Wells HS
3/5/04

The scientist will be allowed to carry out her research on human subjects under a few conditions.

First, a team of experts will be assigned to assist her. She will have time to educate the team about her research to avoid a possible lawsuit against the IRB, and she will have full liability in case of mistake.

Second, the IRB will be permitted to observe her procedures in the lab or through a one-way mirror. As soon as results are obtained the IRB will be first to view them.

Third, regarding the subject, he/she will be allowed certain knowledge of the procedures to make an informed decision about whether or not to continue (this will happen before subject signed any contract or release).

Because she is aware of the potential loss or gain, she is obviously confident in her research and how it can advance the medical field. If she is willing to trust her research to save lives, we have confidence in her.

DT, MC, CF
Mineral Wells High School
3/5/04

We think that the scientist involved with the artificial blood should not do the testing herself because of her financial involvement. We believe that it would benefit the medical center more if she instead was to train at least three other scientists to carry out the experiments for the artificial blood.

Some advantages of her training three other scientists are that the results will be more precise, more people will trust the results, and the testing could be finished faster. With more people doing the testing it is less likely that they will give wrong information. Also people will trust the results more if the three scientists did the testing. If there were three people working on the artificial blood the results would come a lot faster than if only one person were doing the experiments. Also the scientist who is financially involved could be a forth person who works with them. She could either supervise the other three or work with them.

One disadvantage of only her doing the testing by herself is that if she were to work on the tests by herself she might give wrong results so that the tests would be successful no matter what. If she does give the wrong results then people who get the blood during emergencies might not get helped at all. People who get the bad blood might sue the company and the company will lose money anyway. Plus, after a couple of failed transfusions, the IRB would stop using the artificial blood and the company will go bankrupt.

If the blood tests were successful then there would be a lot of advantages in the field of science. First of all, it would take some pressure off blood banks because they often run low on their supply on human blood. Secondly, since the blood does not need to be refrigerated, it can be carried on ambulances easier. Next, the blood will never need to be matched because one type fits all. Finally and most importantly, since the blood does not come from a human donor then there is no risk of spreading diseases like HIV, AIDS, and
other bacterial diseases. That is why the scientist who owns the company should not be able to do the research by herself and why she should be able to train three people to do the research for her.

RY, KT, CB
Mineral Wells, High School
3/5/04

I would definitely allow her to test on human subjects. It is worth the risk to loose some money over many people’s lives. Even if she didn’t do the research right away, I would hope that it would be conducted very soon.

A.H., H.H., J.P.
Mineral Wells H.S
3/5/04

We believe that this case should be carried out. There could be a lot to lose but if the experiment is mastered there could be a lot more to gain. The following guidelines are to clarify the integrity of the experiment.

· Have someone who is partially knowledgeable in this field to see that she properly does the experiment.
· Have them hooked up to monitors to show their blood pressure and heart rate to identify if they’re nervous or hiding a mistake.

If these guidelines are carried out them this experiment could be a major success in the medicine-science field.

A.A., T.C., C.F.
Mineral Wells High School
3/5/04

As the IRB board members it is our job to decide whether or not to allow the scientist, who came up with the idea to make artificial blood that worked on humans, to continue with the research and experiments. To do this there are many different components we have to analyze. First, the whole board must decide and agree on one solution. Next, the board is divided into two different fractions. The first group thinks she should carry out the experiments. The other half thinks she might modify the results to make sure her company does not lose money. The last & most important component is her financial involvement.

Also, to make the best decision you have to list facts you know and facts you don’t know, but need to know. We know that research could make a life and death difference for many people. We know that human nature is to succeed at all costs, even if this nature is subconscious. We know that this research is her idea and it is not fair to take it away from her completely. We also know that results from animal testing sometimes varied from the results from human testing. Other times they turned out the same. You never know which is which. Lastly, we know that the outcome of these experiments could make her company go bankrupt or turn it into a fortune 500 company that makes millions.

We do not know what her exact research is, and how the results have affected the animal experiments so far, either for good or bad? We do not know what kind of person she is, honest or sly? Overall, we do not have enough information or statistics to make and accurate judgment about this situation.

From the information we are given, the solutions we decided on were to let her company continue with the experiments and testing. But, we did apply a few stipulations. Either she has to have someone that the board trusts, that is well educated, to supervise the research & experiments to make sure the results do not get changed. If not that, then a control group would be set up to do the exact same experiment, with no incentive to modify the results. The other stipulation is that the results of each of the three phases must be reviewed and approved by the Federal Food & Drug Administration (FDA).

T.C., J.D. & K.W.
Mineral Wells High School
As heads of the IRB, we have decided to let her go on with her research on a few conditions. She will be asked to train a scientist who is neither employed nor involved with her company to act as the head of the project. This scientist will head up the experiment and she will be minimally involved only checking every now and then to make sure that everything is going smoothly. She will be paid for training the outside scientist and will still get a percentage of the profits from the sale of artificial blood. Finally, a deadline will be voted on by the IRB board and funding will cease unless there are extenuating circumstances, which will again be assessed by the board. Because the scientist is an outside individual, he will be paid regardless of the outcome.

RR, RP and BB
Mineral Wells HS
3/5/04

As head of the medical center's IRB I would give my consent and allow the scientist to proceed in the testing of human subjects. I would insist that the subjects understand the risks they are taking by participating in the experiment and inquire about the validity of the statement regarding preliminary research on animals, making sure that the research does prove to be safe for humans. I would allow this experiment to take place, taking the next step and using human subjects, because of the potential medical advances and life saving techniques its success could generate. I would personally confront the scientist and let her know of the concerns I have regarding her honesty die to the financial ties to the experiment's outcome, allowing her to let me know where she stands on the issue, and emphasizing the importance of separating the two factors. I would insist that she work in collaboration with another highly qualified scientist to minimize decisions made that would directly correlate with her finances, allowing a less bias perspective to be included in the study. I would make sure that ample attention is paid to her results, and order that the testing be repeated by different scientists and new subjects (assuming the health concerns are minimal and procedures are safe) before approving the research or allowing her company to begin manufacturing the artificial blood. Each step of the experiment and its results should be carefully monitored and double-checked, in order to minimize bias that might occur in this experiment's procedures, always emphasizing the importance of the subject's health and safety.

L.K.
Southwest
3/5/04

I would let the scientist carry out this investigation because it could be beneficial to mankind. I would only allow the investigation to go on under a few circumstances: there would be some advisors from my IRB board to supervise her investigation and she would document all of her findings and observations. I think that she is the best person for the job and she will be very valuable to the research. I think that she may be able to discover something that is very crucial and it may save many people's lives. The scientist is also taking a risk by doing this research and could loose all of her money. But she may not be fair and that is why we are supervising her.

3/5/04

As the head of the human subject research review board I would let the research carry on but with conditions. The research would be extremely beneficial if it succeeded so I think that that is reason enough to let the scientist carry out their research. It is extremely great that the scientist heading the research is the best qualified because she understands artificial blood products the best. But since there is a lot of argument about the money situation I would give the research team a supervisor and I would also make them keep record of absolutely everything.

A.R.
The Academy of IISD

3/5/04
I would allow the scientist to proceed with leading the experiments on humans. Yet there is no way one person can be completely unbiased about what she is doing when those kinds of stipulations are involved. Greed affects us all, so I would have her continue to be the head of the experiment along with a colleague of my own to ensure that nothing she reports can be even the slightest untruthful by having my colleague stay along side her and give me another detailed report. And as for extra precautions my colleague will be female and only guaranteed the pay I am granting her so that she can't be persuaded to falsely acknowledge any information.

3/4/04

I would give her my approval with some circumstances. She must be supervised at all experimental procedures, give a specific report of the processes that were made, and present the data, observations and new breakthroughs in the artificial blood.

M.F.
New Diana ISD

3/4/04

I would let the scientist conduct the experiment, because she was the most qualified...but I would definitely have her monitored at all times, just because I don't know if she is a honest person or not. Since this would be such a beneficial study I think that the person that should conduct it has to be chosen wisely otherwise I would find someone new to conduct it.

C.T.
New Diana High School

3/4/04

Well, I would certainly let her be a part of the research, and even let her do some of the research. Only under frequent supervision, of course, so that the "so called results," were true, and the outcome not just to make her or anyone else look good.

S.J.
New Diana High School

3/4/04

I believe that the scientist should not be allowed to carry out her research because she is too closely tied into the financial aspect of the research. She has both too much to gain and too much to lose if the research is a success or a failure. I propose that someone else be brought in to carry out the research.

3/4/04

I think I would let her do the research since she is the most qualified... but then again I would have someone supervising her, just to make sure everything is done honestly.

T.M.
South Texas High School for Health Professions

3/3/04

The first and foremost problems with this case is the financial involvement of the scientist. No matter what the intentions the scientist has, in no way can he/she be 100% faithful to the medical field because money shapes the world. Money shapes the way the scientist will work on the artificial blood, failure is not only a setback for the scientist, but it is also financial loss. Because of the doctor's affiliation with the business, I would vote that she do tests on primates before humans. After this experiment I would like follow up reports and if everything went well then the scientist would have my vote. The average human contains a large amount of blood more than just two or three pints, so only introducing small amounts would enable your immune system to filter out the blood if something went wrong. In my eyes, trying to progress with experiments is much more valuable than compiling data.

3/3/04
The scientist proposing the evidence should be able to carry out the study of artificial blood. The patients that the artificial blood will be tested on are in risk of dying or they would not be needing the blood. If they fully understand the positive and negative outcomes and agree with the procedure then it should be approved. With the ability to make artificial blood, the blood supply will never run out as in past cases. Blood types like O- that are very rare will be in great supply. The risk the scientist and her company will take will be accepted because it is to improve science and human life. With a much greater supply of blood, many disease symptoms (Ex: Sicklecell and Hemophilia) may be relieved with artificial blood at a lower cost than real blood.

D.T.J.
Trinidad High School
3/3/04

I think I would let here go threw with the project because for one you can save lives, and who knows other species in the world. I would set up a lab just for her and have it under raps until she is finished, but if she failed there would be no word of this ever happened.

J.N.
Molina High School
3/3/04

Well, i guess it would be ok to allow them to do the research but first they would need to show the committee consistent positive results and someone has to be constantly watching over them to make sure that everything is done right and if any complications occur they are there to handle any type of situation.

3/2/04

As head of the IRB, I would propose a team of scientist to research this. I would not under any circumstances put this lady on my team. I would use her as a necessary resource guide. If her only concern is for human life, she would be glad to offer her resources in this way. If the out come was successful, I would honor and reward the lady highly. Politics play too big a part in our society today. I would not want to play around with human life.

CO
New Diana High School
3/2/04

If the scientist knows what she is doing, I would let her carry out the research experiment. If there is a problem over the conditions of money, they could find a way to raise some. If this experiment turns out correctly, it would be worth it because it will be saving the lives of others and that is a very important aspect to look at. If the scientist is not completely sure of the honesty, she could find a way to work around it or work it out.

B.M.
Molina High School
3/2/04

In my opinion I think that the scientist should be allowed to preform the experiment with artificial blood if it will help save the lives of people. Any research that is made will help to improve medicine. As a condition for the experiment to take place I would suggest that a contract is made in which the volunteer is aware of the risks. In addition to make sure that the appropriate measures are taken during the experiment.

B.S.
Molina High School
3/2/04
I would allow this scientist to conduct her work, but with boundaries. If she is the best qualified person for the job, than it would be imprudent not to allow her to work on the project. Though her qualifications attest her to be worthy of the job, I do feel that there should be other scientist and researchers working with her to prevent her from skewing the results in her favor. There should be a group of scientists conduction the experiments and compiling and comparing the results; a “team” of sorts. There research would be watched with close scrutiny. I would appoint scientists to work with her, and I would also form a team to supervise the research. These people would be there to make sure the experiments are conducted fairly and correctly. They would make sure the research is conducted in a controlled environment banning the company from having any involvement. The scientist would be the only member from the company permitted to have a hand in the research.

J.N.J.
The Academy Of Irving
3/2/04

In the subject of getting approval on research on human subjects, my opinion is if the patient is 100% sure he/she is positive and is aware of all risks, you can go ahead. But if the patient does not understand all risks, you are not allow to do any type of research. The patient would need to sign a consent form, stating he/she understands everything that is going to happen.

I would approve your research, because if the artificial blood would save lives why hold it from people. I wouldn't have any special conditions concerning the research. Concerning other board members that don't want to approve it, because their excuse is she wouldn't have any money to finish the research, there are lot's of ways of raising money, especially from the community that knows that she wants to help out people and save lives.

J.L.
Socorro High School
3/1/04

I would not let her do the research because, during the study someone might get hurt or killed. Even though it has been studied on animals, there is a difference between humans and animals. I am also against the research because, That is the same as cloning. You are making false blood to help save the lives of many people. I am against cloning so I would be against the research. I would tell her that im against it and then I would tell her she can do the research on her own but she cant use the companies money. I know if the research is successful the company can make a lot of money but that's just a chance the company will have to take.

B.R.
M.E.Molina High School
3/1/04

I would allow her to carry out this research since in essence; this research would be helping mankind if it goes through. The financial aspect of this issue does cause a dishonesty factor, but shouldn't be an issue.

3/1/04

I would let her continue with her research. She knows what she's doing so why shouldn't I let her. I would just make sure that she goes through all the safety precautions necessary.

3/1/04

As president of the IRB you have two responsibilities as relate to this case, both of which relate to safety. First is the integrity of the board, and secondly is the independence of the research and quality of conclusions. When approving research on human beings on must not only avoid situations that would compromise the outcome of the experimental protocol, but also avoid the appearances of those compromises. I would allow the human trials with modifications. A compromise might be as follows: Proposing scientist would be the expert consultant to the IRB. A knowledgeable scientist, with no financial interest in the outcome, would assemble the research team and write the protocol and submit it to the IRB for approval. The proposing
scientist would also be the board’s liaison to the trial team. She would have editorial rights in the fashioning of the final report but have no say in the collection or interpretation of data. The conclusions would be those of the trial team. This preserves the integrity of the trial and the reputation of the proposing scientist in future trials she may be called upon to lead.

B.D.
Physics Teacher
Fossil Ridge High School
3/1/04

I think that she should be allowed to be involved in the research but she should have to have a staff that is highly qualified but non-biased to assist in the research. That way she can help them understand the product but they would be able to separate their emotions and wallet from the issue and concentrate on performing the research correctly

ADM
Euless Junior High
2/29/04

I believe the scientist should be able to conduct her research. This type of research could save a countless number of lives. The board members of course and other scientists would be involved in her work; it would not be completely her. Some very educated people would follow up on her work, and the board members would have to be convinced that her research is valid. We would not just take her up on her word. Her research would be critically looked at, and go through many tests, before it is allowed a chance to be used on people. So, even if she tried to be dishonest, it would most likely be caught.

K.R.H.
Socorro High School
2/29/04

I believe that due to the possible medical breakthrough the artificial blood research would provide, it would be unheard of to not allow the scientist to carry out her research. However, because of her personal involvement, I would recommend a second party be introduced into the picture to insure honest results of the research. On one hand, it may seem unfair to the scientist who has worked so hard on her research, but in order to insure concrete and honest advancing medical break-throughs and more importantly, the safety of the future subjects, someone else should be involved along with the scientist herself.

HCJ
Socorro High
2/29/04

As head of the IRB, I would let her carry out her research for the artificial blood because she is the best for the job, but not alone. I would have a team built for her to help her carry out her research and to make sure it is experimented right and to the fullest ability. The researchers would need to keep a log of what goes on during the experiments and what the results come out to be. This would be checked by me periodically through out the tests. I would have her put a hold on her business of artificial blood, so then if the blood does not have a break through in medical technology, then maybe she won't lose as much money. This discovery and research could save thousands of lives if it does work and make medical history.

L. J.
The Academy of Irving ISD
2/29/04

I would go ahead with the investigation. the bottom line that we have to look at is that if this does work it will save a lot of lives. she obviously has spent money on the research and so if she does get a lot of money then she deserves it. I am a person who always believes in second opinions, and so whatever outcome she comes up with will be back up by a second scientist. this scientist will be very educated in this field but have no kind
of contact or communication with the other scientist, to make sure that there is no dishonesty going on. She should also sign a contract or some sort of agreement stating that she is under oath that if she is dishonest and we are to find out then her license will be stripped against her. As I said before we should not look at how much money on person gets, just at how many lives that one person could save.

A.M.
MANSFIELD-SUMMIT HIGH SCHOOL
2/29/04

My opinion on the new artificial blood for humans is to let the scientist test it on some patients. If the blood works out, let her produce it. Even if it doesn't work, it is her decision to make the blood because she owns the company.

2/29/04

I would allow her to carry out her research on the conditions that she makes a very thorough report on the data she has, updating me and my colleagues frequently. The human test subjects would know of the financial situation and, obviously, all of the risks involved. If there were a new artificial blood type that would save lives, I say that it would be worth the effort to find out if it would help to at least branch off to other methods of blood transfusions and things as such as this.

SR
2/29/04

As head of the IRB I would allow her to carry out this research. This woman is the most qualified person to carry out this research. Why would I jeopardize the efficiency of this research by removing her and replacing her with someone else? That would just be wrong. She owns the artificial blood product company, so what. She's trying to help save lives out there not make a profit. But since it does create such controversy, I would establish special working conditions. I would gather other scientist to work with her and have each retest each other's work, just to keep the work as honest as possible and maintain some level of surveillance. I, too, would have all the people involved in the project sign an "honesty" contract.

J.I.S
Socorro High School
2/29/04

Yes, I would let the lady carry on her research. If it has to do with saving lives of course I will, especially saving human being lives! If she is sure that this artificial blood will benefit humans then there should be no standards she should go by. And if it turns out to be helpful it would really increase the knowledge in healthcare.

A.M.
Molina High School
2/28/04

I believe I would allow the company to do the research with the provision that they allow me to send a representative from the IRB to monitor all experiments done by the company so I could make sure that their "results" were the real deal. I would also have the scientist working on it sign a contract saying that she is completely liable for any problems that happen to come up while she is doing her study. This would be done to further my lack of fault if something does happen to go wrong.

J.H.
New Diana I.S.D
2/28/04

As the head of the IRB, I would allow this scientist to carry out the research considering that she's the best person to carry out this experiment qualifying and understanding artificial blood. While conducting her research I will have another person, basically on the same plane of knowledge, to observe and understanding the process being made. Another way would be to have her write her own data and giving it to me so we can revise and prove her honesty. The sooner she fails or succeeds the sooner we will know on how to save lives or to just keep trying.

M.H.
Molina High School
2/28/04

I would not let her work on the project direct. I would keep her up to date on all developments and tell researchers to talk to her for any information they need. My reason for this is I don't believe that she could provide a good opinion due to her involvement financially.

Molina High School
2/28/04

As head of the IRB I think she should be able to carry out her research for her experiment because she is the most suited for it. This experiment would be extremely beneficial to many people who need blood where they may be none of their type. Since she also owns the company that relies on the success of this experiment there will need to be special conditions. I would ask other board members to see if they would be interested in this experiment also. They will be her assistant. The assistant would keep the notes and records of what she does in this experiment to make sure everything is correct and safe for humans. I believe these conditions will be able to please everyone.

D.L.
Moises Molina High School
2/28/04

As head of the IRB I would allow her to do her research. Before she did her research I would make sure she knows that I was counting on her to do it honestly. I think that you would just have to trust her as a person and hope that she won't let the money influence her decisions.

L.S.
New Diana
2/27/04

As head of the IRB, I believe that the scientist should be able to do her own research on the new artificial blood; matters of financial risk should be isolated from consideration as to whether or not she should be allowed to conduct the research. The possible advantages of this new knowledge outweigh any risk associated with personal investments. If the scientist is willing to gamble with her company, that is her decision. I believe that it is necessary that this scientist do her own research due to the fact that no one is more knowledgeable about every facet of its composition and side-effects on humans (if any). To ensure that partiality due to her personal involvement is curtailed to its fullest extent, a review board composed of qualified personnel should be utilized to supervise and monitor her research to keep bias to an absolute minimum.

The possible ramifications of this experimentation could be ground-breaking; since the preliminary animal testing offered promising results, the human tests are likely to be successful. If this is the case, medicine as we know it could experience a new revolution—blood shortages would be a thing of the past, and this artificial blood would be readily available for use in medical emergencies, car crashes, and other disasters that may possibly occur.

W.M.
She should be allowed to conduct the study. She is the most qualified person for the job. However, because of her involvement with the company and her possible gains, there should be others involved in the study to see that the way she conducts the experiment is ethical.

JP
Summit High School
2/27/04

I think that if I first try to find someone who was basically on the same level as the scientist as to sort of watch what goes on and see that when the time comes that person will be able to approve or disprove what the head scientist says. I would approve her to carry out her research under the agreement that she signs a contract saying that she's liable for what she says and that she would allow herself to be under some supervision. I think that if she is allowed and it turns out that this artificial blood does work than it will be a big boost for healthcare.

2/27/04

I believe that as long as this lady has a committee or another member of a group overlooking her studies, she should be able to conduct her experiment. As long as she explains her actions to the supervisor or group in charge of her because after all she is the most qualified for the job. I believe that the people deserve only the most qualified people working on their lives and future, therefore it should be this lady.

K.H.
Summit High School
2/26/04

I think that the study could be very beneficial, and could save a lot of lives. A person's financial gain should not be a factor in saving human lives, but if it is there a few precautionary measures that could be taken to make sure the job is done honestly. The argument that her financial advancement might be more important to her than medical advancement is a good one. So is the argument that she is fully qualified to do the job. If I were head of the IRB I would allow her to do the research but only under total surveillance. I wouldn't try and find someone else to do the job because, while you are out trying to get another person, people are dying. The sooner the research is confirmed the sooner you can start saving lives. I would make sure that everything being done was recorded and video taped. She would be obligated to sign a contract stating that all information derived at by me is correct and totally honest, before the medical center would consider her research. In the medical field I believe that everyone's main focus should be saving human lives. If one person can be saved with artificial blood then it is all well worth it.

C.B.
SHS
2/26/04

I believe that she should be allowed to carry out her research. This research could help to save many lives, and this product should be fully developed. Even though the scientist who proposes this research is the most qualified to conduct it, there needs to be a group of scientist that are in charge along with her. This way she will be able to help with the research and it will still be done objectively.

K.S.Summit High School
2/26/04

As head of the IRB, I would allow the scientist to carry out the research experiment, because it would be beneficial to millions of lives. I would allow to research on her own, since she is the best qualified person to carry out the research due to her understanding of the artificial blood product better than anyone else. I would require her to write out her data and show how she did her experiment so that I can hire other scientists that
are not affiliation with her and the company to repeat her experiment. I would give rewards to the scientist that found any mistake from her experiment. This would create a tension in her to do a good job and not to lie about her research solution. If she did her research successfully then she would receive the credit and the other scientists just receive their salary from repeating the experiment. This would convince her to be honest about her research or other scientist can take the credit from her, and she would be ashamed if the IRB knows that she lie about the experiment. I think that it's worth a try to let her research on the artificial blood for the future improvements on medicine.

T. D.
Summit High School
2/26/04

As head of the IRB, I would permit the woman to conduct her experiment with rules and regulations. Such as she would have a team, but there would be someone else as the team head. I would also have her pull funding from somewhere else in addition to her pocket or that of her companies pocket. If it works though, all money and success would go to her and her company. This would be just a precaution from tempting her to hinder the experiment.

C.M.
Summit High School
2/26/04

I believe that she should be allowed to continue her research on humans. She should be under the supervision of another scientist to make sure that she is doing everything honestly. Since the artificial blood has already been proven safe for animals, than there is no reason why it should not be tested on humans. Without her experiment we will never know if she has found a medical break-through. Every subject should be aware of the risks he or she will be taking. Everything she does must be written down and dated for reference. Under these circumstances, I believe her research will be a great benefit. If it does not work, then we can find a way to make it work.

CAG
Summit High School
2/26/04

As head of the IRB, I would allow this woman to conduct the experiment with someone fair and balanced to report to me if she is not working honestly. If this worked, our company would make lots of money which is worth the risk. It could also help save lives of other people needing this experiment. Because it worked well on animals, I would allow her to test it on humans with their consent. They would have to understand the risks.

L.
New Diana ISD
2/26/04

As head of the IRB, I would not let the scientist be in charge of the research. Even though she is well qualified for the research, there's still a chance that something could go wrong. If she was to lie, not only would she make herself look bad, she would also make me as head of the IRB and the company look bad. If she is scared about risking the company's money, she shouldn't even be during the research. I would have to get someone else even thought they aren't as qualified to do the job. Whether he/she messes up, the point is that they be truthful.

A.A.
Summit High School
2/26/04

I as the head of the IRB would definately have to review the studies very closely. I would allow to go ahead with the experiment on humans; however I would make it be only under the condition that another doctor that
I would believe would be well qualified would be consulted in the decisions. I would not risk losing a possible cure. This could ultimately save many peoples lives, especially during blood shortages.

H.F.
New Caney High School
2/26/04

As a head of IRB, I would allow her to carry out this research under some restrict conditions. Even though this research will take many risks, I would support her company to do this experiment since it saves many lives. Risks always follow in any experiments. If everyone fears to fail, then who is going to deal with this business? IRB exist for this kind of businesses and for human being. Since she is the best-qualified person to carry out research, this is a time to get opportunity. I would work with her every time and employee other scientists from anywhere who are also qualified and are not associated with her in privacy. Even if the research is failed, there will be some benefits in medication at least one.

C.K.
Summit High School
2/26/04

In my opinion, the research should be done. The artificial blood will be able to help those in need. The proposal allows research to be done in order to help the lives of many. Artificial blood will be able to be used in certain situation when human blood is unable to be used.

The monetary problem is only an issue because the people are unwilling to take chances in order to help better humanity. The only conditions that will be given to her will:

1. The ones that are tested on will be given all the information and side-effects that may seen.
2. The company and her own financial state will be the only effected by the outcome. If she loses money, the only person she can blame is herself. If they get the money, the study for humans will be expanded. The search for expansion of medicine will not be found if people are unwilling to take chances. Blood transfusions are not always successful, and without another solution we are unable to save lives.

M
SHS
2/26/04

As head of the IRB, of course I will allow her to continue her research. However, this experiment is very complex and she will need more help. She cannot do the entire experiment alone and needs the help of other scientist. If the artificial blood proves to be beneficial to humans, this has the potential of saving a lot of lives. This research experiment could quite possibly expand our knowledge and skills in the health care profession.

A.B.
SHS
2/26/04

As head of IRB, I would allow her to proceed in this research. Because even though there is a risk of the research project going downhill, there is also a chance that the research could possibly save millions of lives. I would set some limits though, I would appoint a team of people to work along with her and to make sure that she didn't do anything sneaky and I would also appoint a chairperson to oversee the overall project and make sure things ran smoothly, and they wouldn't be able to do research on the project unless the chairperson was there.

J.
SHS
2/26/04

As head of the IRB, I would allow her to carry out her research because she is the expert on the subject, and she has more experience with the material than anyone else, but she will have to do it under certain conditions. My conditions would be:

1. To make sure that she does not do anything dishonest due to her financial involvement, she will have to give me daily financial reports, progress reports on what she did, what she discovered, and daily reports on the condition of the individuals who are being tested on.

2. She will not neglect to stop the research when I think it is not giving the results we expected, and if any of the patient's health is poor due to the research.

Those are the conditions I would give her in order for her to carry out her research.

S.A.C
Socorro High School
2/26/04

I would let her carry out her project because she is the only one that knows the real effect and she knows the product better than anyone that knows about the artificial blood. The only way that I would her proceed on doing her experiments would be that she has to have someone there that could be there to watch to see what she is doing. Someone would have to be there to supervise her on everything that she does, and everyday I would have to get a progress report on the projects. I also would need to have a agenda that would be followed very strict.

O.S
2/26/04

As the head of the IRB i beleive that they should let her do he research because she is the most qualified person for the job. i would also let another scientist be there with her that would knows just as much about the artificial blood product supervise just to make sure that she is honest one what she is doing. And for no problems to happend. i believe that this would save peoples lifes in the future.

T.A.
Academy
2/26/04

As the head of the IRB i would allow the scientist to proceed with the research on human subjects. But scientist would have to agree to allow the board to select a qualified scientist to accompany her in her research. there should also be a supervisor to watch over the scientist to make sure everything is runs ethically. If they say that the scientist is the one that has better knowlage in doing this then i believe that this artificial blood would be beneficial to people in the future.

Academy of Irving Isd
2/26/04

I as head of IRB would allow her to run her experiment under some conditions. As an IRB committee we would appoint people through out the company who would assist her in her project. There would also be a book kept by me and two other colleagues over work they have submitted and conducted. I would also appoint a person who would be with the group as an overseer of the entire project. They would not be able to work unless he was there to supervise.

I think her idea sounds wonderful, but has potential for being turned into something less then beneficiary for humankind. The artificial blood could save hundreds of thousands of lives, it is essential that this be conducted so we know as if to go further with it or not.
Z.G.
The Academy of Irving ISD
2/25/04

I would not let her work on the project directly. I would keep her up to date on all developments and tell researchers to talk to her for any information they needed. My reasoning for this is I don’t believe that she could provide an unbiased opinion due to her financial involvement.

LHFC
2/25/04

I would first try to find an unbiased scientist not affiliated with the company to carry out the research. If I could not find someone qualified enough to complete the research, I would then allow this scientist to carry out the research herself. However, there would be very strict regulations that come with performing this experiment. She would have to have a non-affiliated scientist to oversee the experiment. If at any time he/she found the experiment to be made to favor results that the company wanted, all results would be considered null and void and the experiment would no longer continue.

M.R.
Summit High School
2/25/04

She should be allowed to do her research which in subject to review by outside observers who do not have a conflict of interest.

DWC
Bishop Lynch HS
2/25/04

As head of the IRB, I would allow the scientist to carry out the research experiment, but under strict regulations. There is a possibility that the financial risks of her company may hinder her ability to carry out the research honestly; therefore, I would not allow her to be the head of the research program. I would hire a committee of people that have no affiliation with her and her company. The scientist would be a part of the committee, but every decision made would be a unanimous vote between the group. This would incorporate a balance, which will not allow the scientist sole oversight of the research experiment. If the experiment indeed adds to the advancing knowledge of medical science by being effective in the human test subjects, the scientist will have to negotiate her business plans with the IRB and the selected research committee members. I would make the scientist give the medical center a small percentage of the proceeds for allowing her to conduct the research in our facility. If the scientist is truly performing this research to save lives, these conditions will not deter her from experimenting with the artificial blood on humans. She would have to agree to these stipulations and sign a contract in order to have IRB approval.

S.E.
Summit High School
2/25/04

On her own, I wouldn’t advise her to go with the experiment because there are too many risks involved. As the head of IRB, I wouldn’t want that kind of responsibility on my hands. Since she volunteered for the experiment, I would recommend for other IRB workers, besides myself, to be present during the proceedings. This way, there will be someone who knows what to do in case of emergencies and a witness to any complications. As far as the experiment itself is concerned, I wouldn’t mind going through with it if someone volunteered to be the guineas pig because the chances of the experiment working sounds good.

S.V.
2/25/04

As head of the IRB, I would allow her to perform the procedure. Since this experiment is so complicated, I would require her to have help. In which, I would be there to make sure that everything is done in the correct manner. She would have to be open to changes. Financially, it is her choice in whether this be done or not. This experiment could save many lives, so therefore she would have my support regardless of many other peoples views.

B.K.
Mansfield-Summit High School

2/25/04

AS IRB boar, I will allow to the scientist to carry on the research. To let her experience, because nothing has been discover without try it on first. This is the way science and health had develop lots of medication by testing thier hypotesis and they have succed. I dont see why this new Artificial blood should not be test.

F.O
The Academy Of Irving

2/25/04

I would allow her to carry hot this research since in essence; this research would be helping mankind if it goes through. The financial aspect of this issue does cause a dishonesty factor, but shouldn't be an issue. Since it is, the scientist should be able to head the research, but must display to the IRB a presentation that this treatment really works. If the IRB agrees after the presentation then the plan should completely go through. The better of mankind is more important than the financial issues of one person, especially if it benefits many people.

R.P
The Academy of Irving ISD

2/25/04

I think that she should carry out the job because she obviously knows more about the artificial blood product. However, to ensure that her job is done honestly as head of the board I would place a couple of scientists to monitor her work, and learn more about the product, and if it will be effective. This will also be less criticism for her because she won't be the only one overseeing this job. I also think that there is no problem in her financial success if the product does work, as long as the scientists also benefit. Before she starts the experiment, the scientists should be able to also test the product, so that we are more sure that the product will be safe on humans.

SM
Academy of Irving ISD High School

2/25/04

As we all know, during major injury within the emergency room, many patient die because they loose too much blood; from wounds or dramatic trauma. In any case, when we are given an opportunity to reduce such an obstacle, we should take the benefit to account. The doctor who is head of this research must understand that even if she was to carry out this research in way that isn't completely honest, the key issues is if this will work and the chance that it will work. When we look at the benefit in the issue, that knowledge that will come from it, will only promote better health care and understanding in the science of blood. In any understanding, if she is able to jump over the IRM hoops and by pass their scrutiny, the FDA and other governmental base organization will future test her product before them but it to market. Beside, her company must be working efficiently and has such a trustful base for them to have that much money to spend. So what I would do is say yes, but continue to keep and eye on her.

A.L.
Academy of IISD
I think that the scientist should go on and conduct her experiment. That is the only way we learn things, it is if we test it. There should be someone who is watching them, aiding them, if they need help. You can’t just do something this big by your self. It would be good for both the scientist and the person helping her; she will be a little relieved. If she has some help then if she does succeed she will have witnesses, which will only help her in the long run.

AS  
Academy IISD  
2/25/04

As the head of the IRB I would not allow her to conduct the research by herself. It is an important investigation and certainly it will advance our knowledge and ability to save more lives but there are a lot of interests involved in this situation. If her priority is to contribute to humanity by discovering a new type of artificial blood then she must agree to the conditions that the IRB establishes in order to successfully investigate this kind of blood. We must gather qualified scientists and form a committee. This board including the scientist with the artificial blood proposal will collaborate and test the blood in humans. A qualified member of the IRB must be present at all times and his/her responsibility will be to report any irregularity to us. This will ensure accuracy and prevent any interference.

A.N.  
Summit High School  
2/24/04

As the head of the ISB board, I would allow the scientist to proceed with the research on human subjects but with mandatory stipulations. The scientist would have to agree to allow the board to select a qualified scientist to accompany her in her research. If the scientist proceeds with the research alone, the data collected could be easily strayed in favor of the scientist's company. The scientist accompanying the researcher would have to have no affiliation with the blood company or the scientist who owns the blood company. The two scientists will be supervised during all interaction to prevent bribing. Because this breakthrough has the possibility of being so beneficial for so many people, the research on humans is worth the risk.

A.H  
SHS  
2/23/04

If this particular scientist is the most qualified to carry out the research, she should be able to. Her findings could be questionable, due to her financial involvement, however. This scientist could be subject to a “checks and balances” type system to help resolve this issue. She could work along side an unbiased group of researchers that would honestly carry out the research. Ultimately, the most knowledgable person on the subject needs to be involved.

L.H.  
Summit High School  
2/19/04

My team and I believe that this research should be carried out do to all the advantages it would have in the world today. However, we believe that there should be a supervisor to watch over the scientist to make sure everything is ran ethically. With the shortage of blood and people that have rare blood types this new technology of artificial blood would make certain aspects of the medical field a lot easier. We also believe that financial cost should be watched very closely.

T.O.  
Tri Star Med Prep, St. Marys, Ohio
We say yes and let her carry the whole thing out. Have a second party that doesn't work for her oversee the research just for precaution. In the future it would help with blood shortages and help with passing on less diseases and sicknesses. If it works right, ll the research will be worth it. If they don't, they won't know that maybe on day artificial blood could help. If she carries out the research, then she could take the least amount of people and test them. Watch their health and chart their improvements. They say she can carry out this whole thing because she knows what she is doing, so it could be beneficial to the future. Also if it can work on animals, it should work on humans because they both have about the same internal organs. So with what we included in this, the research will be helpful.

J.R.  
Tri Star Med Prep, St. Marys Ohio  
2/9/04

I would let her carry out the research mostly because she is the most qualified person for the job. I would have another person who knows almost just as much as her about the artificial blood product supervise her to make sure she is honest on her research results. I would not let an unqualified person carry out the research on humans especially with peoples lives at risk. Before I would let her try the product on humans I would first let the supervisor try out the product on the animals to make sure it really does work. I would also have a background check done on the scientist to ensure she had not had any business scams ect. in the past. This product if successful would not only be beneficial to her but to everyone.

M.O.  
Frisco High School  
2/6/04

As the most qualified scientist for the research, she should be allowed to perform her experiments with artificial blood, as this research has the potential to further human knowledge and the study of medicine. Since her financial link to the artificial blood company causes her honesty to come under question, however, the IRB could opt to ask her to work alongside a team of scientists, who do not own stock in her company and could contribute to the experiment, as well. If it is not possible for this scientist to work with a team, a separate group of scientists could perform the same experiment and the IRB could compare their respective data to negate the possibility of sabotage. Alternately, she could be intermittently subjected to examinations by a representative of the IRB, who would take note of her progress and make sure that the integrity of the experiment is maintained.

Frisco High School .  
2/5/04

If this scientist wants to run this experiment, she should be able to. Just because she is a direct contact with the artificial blood company, does not mean that she should not be able to run tests herself and make money off of the hopeful positive results. There is not a high demand of blood transfusions for animals at the moment so the only possible way for her to make a decent profit is to prove that this blood is useable on people. There is no way that she could be dishonest without eventually getting sued. Today in this world, people are sued for the stupidest things, so she most likely would not be stupid and do something illegal. Also, it's unethical to let technology this great just pass by without letting someone try to see if it works.

O.B.  
Frisco High School