

9-10. NRCBL: 18.6. Comments: Comment on: Shamoo, Adil E.; Schwartz, Jack. Universal and uniform protections of human subjects in research. *American Journal of Bioethics* 2008 November; 8(11): 3-5.

Shamoo, Adil E.; Schwartz, Jack. Universal and uniform protections of human subjects in research. *American Journal of Bioethics* 2008 November; 8(11): 3-5. NRCBL: 18.6. SC: le. Comments: See comments in: *American Journal of Bioethics* 2008 November; 8(11): 6-22.

Shuchman, Miriam. Clinical trials regulation — how Canada compares [news]. *CMAJ/JAMC: Canadian Medical Association Journal* 2008 September 23; 179(7): 635-638. NRCBL: 18.6; 21.1. Identifiers: Canada; United Kingdom (Great Britain); United States.

Sim, Ida. Trial registration for public trust: making the case for medical devices. *JGIM: Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2008 January; 23(Supplement 1): 64-68. NRCBL: 18.6; 9.7.

Sotelo, Julio. Regulation of clinical research sponsored by pharmaceutical companies: a proposal. *PLoS Medicine* 2006 July; 3(7): e306. NRCBL: 18.6; 9.7. SC: le.

Spriggs, Merle. The ethics of research on less expensive, less effective interventions: a case for analysis. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* 2008 December; 5(4): 295-302. NRCBL: 18.6; 7.4; 18.5.2; 18.3; 16.1; 18.2. SC: an; cs.

Abstract: The Kennedy Krieger lead paint study is a landmark case in human experimentation and a classic case in research ethics. In this paper I use the lead paint study to assist in the analysis of the ethics of research on less expensive, less effective interventions. I critically evaluate an argument by Buchanan and Miller who defend both the Kennedy Krieger lead paint study and public health research on less expensive, less effective interventions. I conclude that Buchanan and Miller's argument is flawed but that does not mean that research designed to find less effective interventions cannot be justified in some situations. Based on my analysis, I suggest questions to ask when considering such research and I offer some principles to guide us. In the process, light is shed on the various debates and issues raised by the lead paint study; e.g. standards of care, researchers' responsibilities to research subjects, the distinction between treatment and research and the question of what it is that legitimizes public health research.

Stewart, Paul. Regulation — the real threat to clinical research. *BMJ: British Medical Journal* 2008 November 8; 337(7678): 1085-1087. NRCBL: 18.6; 18.2; 9.6. SC: cs. Identifiers: United Kingdom (Great Britain).

Street, Jackie; Baum, Fran; Anderson, Ian. Developing a collaborative research system for Aboriginal health. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 2007 August; 31(4): 372-378. NRCBL: 18.6; 18.5.1. SC: em. Identifiers: Australia.

Strid, Judy. Ethical dilemmas: a consumer perspective. *Monash Bioethics Review* 1994 July; 13(3, Ethics Committee Supplement): S3-S14. NRCBL: 18.6; 18.2; 18.5.3; 16.2. SC: cs. Identifiers: New Zealand. Note: Reprinted

from Coney, Sandra, ed. *Unfinished Business: What Happened to the Cartwright Report?* Auckland: Women's Health Action, 1993: 110-124.

Tharyan, Prathap. Ethics committees and clinical trials registration in India: opportunities, obligations, challenges and solutions. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics* 2007 October-December; 4(4): 168-169. NRCBL: 18.6; 18.2; 9.8.

Tharyan, Prathap; Gheri, Davina. Registering clinical trials in India: a scientific and ethical imperative. *National Medical Journal of India* 2008 January-February; 21(1): 31-34. NRCBL: 18.6; 18.5.9; 18.2.

Thornton, Hazel. Patient and public involvement in clinical trials is established worldwide, but encouragement is needed to promote institutional collaboration and avoid duplication of effort [editorial]. *BMJ: British Medical Journal* 2008 April 26; 336(7650): 903-904. NRCBL: 18.6; 18.2. Identifiers: United Kingdom (Great Britain).

United States. Department of Health and Human Services. Office of the Secretary. Office of Public Health and Science. Office for Human Research Protections. Request for information and comments on the implementation of human subjects protection training and education programs. Notice. *Federal Register* 2008 July 1; 73(127): 37460-37463. NRCBL: 18.2; 18.6; 7.2. SC: le.

Van Bokkelen, Gil. The role of the federal government in overseeing medical research. *Journal of Law and Health* 2006-2007; 20(2): 299-308. NRCBL: 18.6; 5.3. SC: le.

Vasgird, D.R.; Hensleigh, M.; Berkman, A.; Schachne, E.; Trinh, C. Protecting the uninsured human research subject. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 2000 November; 6(6): 37-47. NRCBL: 18.6; 1.3.9; 18.2; 9.3.1.

Vernillo, Anthony. Pragmatism as a complementary approach to legislation: closing regulatory gaps in human subject research. *American Journal of Bioethics* 2008 November; 8(11): 15-17. NRCBL: 18.6. SC: le. Comments: Comment on: Shamoo, Adil E.; Schwartz, Jack. Universal and uniform protections of human subjects in research. *American Journal of Bioethics* 2008 November; 8(11): 3-5.

Wallwork, Ernest. Ethical analysis of research partnerships with communities. *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal* 2008 March; 18(1): 57-85. NRCBL: 18.6; 18.2; 18.3; 1.1. SC: rv.

Abstract: Community-researcher partnerships constitute one of the most important recent developments in biomedical ethics. The partnerships protect vulnerable communities within which research is conducted and help ensure that the communities benefit from the research. At the same time, they embody deep, core values about the social nature of persons and the value of community that significantly modify the radical individualism too often associated with the prevailing concepts of autonomy and respect for persons. This article examines the burgeoning literature on community-researcher partnerships to identify the