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**International Human Research and Ethics Standards: A Compilation of Legal Protections in Countries**

**S. Ly**, W.P. Magee, 3rd; 1University of California, Los Angeles, USA, 2Children’s Hospital Los Angeles, Los Angeles, USA

**Background:** Human research investigations, including population-based studies and clinical trials, have the potential to alleviate the burden of diseases that disproportionately affects many low- and middle-income countries (1). The advent of globally recognized standards in ethical research conduct has placed human rights at the forefront of investigations (2-4). While standards are not legally enforceable, countries have adopted legislation to protect human subjects. The extent of legal protections varies by country and may be dependent on existing governmental and scientific infrastructure.

**Methods:** The U.S. Office for Human Research Protections compiles an annual compilation of international human research standards in 120 countries (5). This database reviews thousands of laws, regulations, and guidelines related to the conduct of human subjects research. Each country is appended with legislation from eight core areas: general provisions, drugs and devices, clinical trial registries, research injury, privacy/data protection, biological materials, genetic, and embryo, stem cells, and cloning. A descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to explore the extent of countries with any protections in each of the eight categories. Each country was assigned a binary code if there was some legislation or standard reported in each of the categories and a total score was given to assess total categories covered.

**Findings:** A total of 118 countries had some information. A majority of countries had general human subjects standards (88.1%) and drugs and devices standards (83.9%) while the least coverage was found for country-level clinical trial registries (18.6%). Among the five regions defined by the database, North American and European countries had an average score across categories of 8 and 5.70, respectively. Contrastingly, Asian, Pacific, and the Middle Eastern countries (score = 3.97), Latin American and Caribbean countries (score = 3.14), and African (score = 2.22) had scores below half of eight categories.

**Interpretation:** Ethics and IRBs (Institutional Review Boards) are an essential component of human subjects research. While many studies are conducted in low- and middle-income countries, adequate protections afforded to subjects in these areas may not be adequate. This analysis describes the unmet need for legal protections for participants. Further work is needed to delineate appropriate standards.

**Source of Funding:** None.

**Abstract #: LAN.002**

**Collaborative Governance in Primary Health Care Facilities, Western Kenya: What is the Influence from the Community?**

**J.C. Sitienei**, M. Nangami, L. Manderson; 1Wits University/Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya, 2Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya, 3Monash University, Victoria, Australia

**Program/Project Purpose:** Community participation in governance refers to the collective involvement and engagement of people in decision making, either individually or collectively, in assessing