

## **Author's response to reviews**

**Title:** How Do We Know That Research Ethics Committees are Really Working?  
The Neglected Role of Outcomes Assessment in Research Ethics Review

### **Authors:**

Carl H Coleman ([colemaca@shu.edu](mailto:colemaca@shu.edu))

Marie Charlotte Bouesseau ([bouesseaum@who.int](mailto:bouesseaum@who.int))

**Version:** 2 **Date:** 27 February 2008

### **Author's response to reviews:**

We appreciate the reviewer's thoughtful comments on our manuscript. We have addressed each of the comments as follows:

1. Søren Holm raises an important point: even a badly-functioning ethics review system is better than nothing. We have added a paragraph on page 7 that makes this point.
2. We have added a paragraph to the introduction that raises Jerry Menikoff's point about the relationship between the issues discussed in the article and the debate over the costs and benefits of IRB review in the United States. We chose not to say much about that debate because it raises issues that go beyond the scope of this article, but we agree that highlighting the connection is helpful.
3. In response to Colin Gavaghan's comments, we added a citation (including a web link) to the specific portion of the New Zealand law that conditions compensation for injuries on approval by an ethics review committee, and we have made clear that this point applies only to the national no-fault compensation system.