NATIONAL OFFICE FOR RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEES

NREC-MD Meeting Minutes

20th March 2025

Attendance

Name	Role	Attendance/ Apologies
Prof. Barry O'Sullivan	Chair	Attended
Prof. Mary Sharp	Deputy Chair	Attended
Prof. Declan Patton	Deputy Chair	Attended
Dr Caitriona Cahir	Member	Apologies
Dr Daniel Coakley	Member	Apologies
Dr Mireille Crampe	Member	Attended
Dr Ruth Davis	Member	Attended
Dr Owen Doody	Member	Apologies
Dr Frank Houghton	Member	Apologies
Dr James Gilroy	Member	Attended
Dr Gloria Kirwan	Member	Apologies
Ms Orla Lane	Member	Attended
Prof. Cara Martin	Member	Attended
Mr Billy McCann (PPI)	Member	Attended
Prof. Tom Melvin	Member	Apologies
Prof. Therese Murphy	Member	Attended
Dr Declan O'Callaghan	Member	Apologies
Dr Clare O'Connor	Member	Attended
Prof Paul O'Connor	Member	Attended
Dr Joanne O'Dwyer	Member	Attended
Mr Damien Owens	Member	Attended
Prof. Mahendra Varma	Member	Apologies
Mr Peter Woulfe	Member	Apologies
Ms Simone Walsh	Member	Attended

Louise Houston	Project Officer, National Office for Research Ethics Committees
Dr Sarah McLoughlin	Programme Officer, National Office for Research Ethics Committees
Dr Lucia Prihodova	Programme Manager, National Office for Research Ethics Committees
Dr Emily Vereker	Head of Office, National Office for Research Ethics Committees
Ciaran Horan*	Administrative Assistant, National Office for Research Ethics Committees

*Drafted minutes

Quorum for decisions: Yes

Agenda, discussion and decisions	
1. Welcome and apologies	The Chairperson welcomed the Committee, acknowledged apologies and opened the meeting.
2. Report on Committee business	Noted
3. Minutes of previous meeting	Adopted
4. Declarations of interest	None Member Name: Application ID Name stepped out of the meeting for the discussion of the application.
5. 25-NREC-MD-003-R1	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Dr Patrick Nicholson (RCSI) • Sponsor: CereVasc, Inc.

	• Study title: Pivotal Study to Evaluate the Safety and Effectiveness of the CereVasc® eShunt® System in the Treatment of Normal Pressure Hydrocephalus (STRIDE) • NREC-MD decision: Favourable with conditions • Associated conditions: – The study insurance policy must be extended to cover all 30 participants in the study (treatment and control groups).
6. 25-NREC-MD-004	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Dr Emer Hanrahan (St Vincent's University Hospital) • Sponsor: Ventana Medical Systems, Inc. (Roche Tissue Diagnostics; "RTD") • Study title: Clinical Performance Study Protocol for Use of the VENTANA PD-L1 (SP263) CDx Assay: Evaluation of PD-L1 Expression Levels in Non-small Cell Lung Cancer Specimens from Phase III Study D702GC00001 (ARTEMIDE-Lung04) • NREC-MD decision: Favourable with conditions • Associated conditions: – The NREC-MD noted that the Certificate of Accreditation for the laboratory in the USA had expired on 18th February 2025 and that it is planned that the accreditation is renewed. The Committee request that a renewed Certificate of Accreditation for the laboratory is provided to the National Office once obtained. – The NREC-MD noted that there were inconsistencies in the application documentation regarding the total number of participants that will be enrolled in Ireland. The Committee request clarification of the total number of participants that will be enrolled in the performance study in Ireland. – The NREC-MD request that it is highlighted in the Participant Information Leaflet that participant samples will be moved outside Ireland and tested in the USA. – The NREC-MD request that all references to REC/NREC-MD being given access to any participant data are removed, as the Committee would never request this.
7. 25-NREC-MD-005	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Prof Faisal Sharif (University Hospital Galway) • Sponsor: Medtronic Vascular, Inc • Study title: Spyral InSight Early Clinical Feasibility Study • NREC-MD decision: Request for further information • Further information requested:

Study design

- In relation to the devices used for renal denervation and the renal nerve stimulation system (RNS) devices used in this study, the NREC-MD requests clarification on the following:
    a. Does the CE marking of the denervation devices allow for use with the RNS devices?
    b. Will the performance of the renal denervation devices and the RNS system be assessed as a single system? If yes, the study objectives and all relevant documentation must be amended accordingly.
- The Committee request clarification on how the sample size and size of subgroups in part 1a, 1b and 2 was determined. The Committee understands that this is a proof of concept study and that no formal sample calculation was carried out, however given the risks related to participation in the study, the Committee requests clarification on whether meaningful conclusions can be drawn from the data collected in this study.
- The NREC-MD noted that a maximum of 19 participants will be recruited and that “6-12 participants will be used to determine the appropriate stimulation profile and sedation level, which will be applied in the procedures for an additional 7-13 subjects to assess the safety of and characterize physical response to RNS”.
    a. Outline how was the range of 6-12 determined.
    b. Outline what procedures are in place if an appropriate stimulation profile and sedation level cannot be determined.
- The NREC-MD noted that the risk related to exposure to ionising radiation is considered verging on unacceptable in this study. The Committee requests clarification on:
    a. The necessity of the exposure. Are there any alternative methods that could be used to minimise exposure?
    b. Implications of such exposure on future health care procedures, eg future imaging. If applicable, this information must be included in the PIL.
- In light of the significant risks associated with the additional ionising radiation involved in the study, the NREC-MD requests a confirmation that the study was reviewed and approved by the site radiation safety committee.

	Recruitment - The NREC-MD noted that 'potential participants will be approached by members of the clinical care team' and requests that where possible, the Principal Investigator is not the person who is making contact with and inviting patients to participate in this study. **Participant information leaflet / informed consent form (PIL/ICF)** - The NREC-MD requests the sentence "your doctor recommends you get denervation treatment" is removed from the PIL. - The purpose of the study, as it is described, "to characterize the physiological reaction to renal nerve stimulation in humans", is not fully accurate and should be elaborated to include the fact that this is a proof of concept study to determine whether or not the device can predict successful delivery of renal denervation. - In relation to the study risk, the NREC-MD requests that the likelihood/ categorisation of likelihood of all risks is included. - The NREC-MD will never request access to participant data. Reference to this should be removed from the PIL/ICF. - In relation to future use of data, the NREC-MD noted discrepancy in the description of future use of data in the PIL, which was considered very broad, and the ICF, which refers to 'vascular diseases'. The Committee requests the PIL text is revised to align with the consent wording. - Furthermore in relation to future use of data, the Committee requests a due consideration is given to the consent options available to participants. In line with best practice, participants should be offered a chance to: • consent to future research, • consent to be contacted in relation to future research, and • decline for their data to be used in future research. The NREC-MD advises the applicant that subsequent research ethics review must be sought for specific research once clearly defined. - Given the complex nature of this study and the risks involved, the NREC-MD requests that a qualified member of the study team goes through the PIL with potential participants, focusing on the risks of the study to ensure that the

	participant fully understands each one e.g. exposure to radiation. **Insurance** The NREC-MD noted that the study insurance policy cover is lower than the value set by the State's Claims Agency and requests this is justified.
8. 25-NREC-MD-006	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Prof Faisal Sharif (University Hospital Galway • Sponsor: Medtronic Vascular, Inc • Study title: SPYRAL GEMINI Pilot Study • NREC-MD decision: Request for further information • Further information requested: **Study design** - In light of the significant risks associated with the additional ionising radiation involved in the study, the NREC-MD requests a confirmation that the study was reviewed and approved by the site radiation safety committee. - The NREC-MD requests that all participants receive a separate smart phone from the sponsor for the purposes of the study, in order to ensure that any liability for a data breach lies solely with the sponsor and not the participant. - The NREC-MD requests further information on the Simplera Sensor and phone system and clarification if the Simplera System is considered investigational in this clinical investigation. - The NREC-MD requests confirmation if the diuretic included in the "on-med cohort" will be prescribed to participants due to their participation in the study or is it included in the standard of care. - The NREC-MD noted that the onus is on the General Practitioner (GP) to contact the sponsor in relation to patient visits outside of the study. Given the burden and time constraints already present in the primary care system, the Committee request that the sponsor to reach out to the participants GP in relation to this. - Given the follow up period for this study is 3 years, the NREC-MD requests clarification on anticipated attrition rate during the follow up period. Clarify if there is a plan in place if

	significant number of participants exit the study over the 3 year period. - Given that participants will have to discontinue taking antihypertensive medication, clarify if there is scope to recruit participants who are not taking any antihypertensive medication. **Recruitment** - The NREC-MD request that recruitment will be undertaken by a member of the research team who is not a member of the prospective participants medical team. **Participant information leaflet / informed consent form** - Given the complex nature of the study and the number of procedures and steps, the NREC-MD request that two separate PIL/ICF documents are prepared for each study group, e.g. one for the 'on-med' group and one for the 'off-med', to minimise any confusion and assist participants in their understanding of the study. - The NREC-MD requests the sentence "your doctor recommends you get denervation treatment" is removed from the PIL. - The NREC-MD requests that the PIL/ICF be reviewed for typos and formatting errors. - The NREC-MD requests that additional information is provided in the PIL/ICF to outline the benefits of this study as it compares with standard of care. - NREC-MD will never request access to participant data. Reference to this should be removed from the PIL/ICF. - In relation to future use of data, the NREC-MD noted discrepancy in the description of future use of data in the PIL, which was considered very broad, and the ICF, which refers to 'vascular diseases'. The Committee requests the PIL text is revised to align with the consent wording. - Furthermore in relation to future use of data, the Committee requests a due consideration is given to the consent options available to participants. In line with best practice, participants should be offered a chance to: • consent to future research, • consent to be contacted in relation to future research, and

	• decline for their data to be used in future research. The NREC-MD advises the applicant that subsequent research ethics review must be sought for specific research once clearly defined. - Given the complex nature of this study and the risks involved, the NREC-MD requests that a qualified member of the study team goes through the PIL with potential participants, focusing on the risks of the study to ensure that the participant fully understands each one e.g. exposure to radiation. **Data protection** - The NREC-MD requests clarification on how long data will be stored for and how it will be archived / destroyed in due course, and that this information is included in the PIL/ICF. If appropriate the PIL/ICF should include a specific consent box for anonymisation of data. **Insurance** - The NREC-MD noted that the insurance certificates expire in 2026 and requests confirmation that the insurance policy will be renewed for the duration of the study. **Financial arrangements** - The NREC-MD notes that reasonable expenses up to €400 will be covered by the sponsor. All reasonable expenses should be covered by the sponsor.
9. 25-NREC-MD-007	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Dr Gerard O'Sullivan (University Hospital Galway) • Sponsor: Intervene • Study title: RECAN - Recana Thrombectomy Catheter for Chronic Venous Obstruction and Occlusion Study" (RECANA Study) • NREC-MD decision: Request for further information • Further information requested: - The NREC-MD is not in a position to return a final ethics opinion based on the information and documentation received thus far. In this regard, the Committee requires additional information to inform its deliberations. On behalf of the NREC-MD, the Chair Prof. Barry O'Sullivan requests that the points listed below are addressed:

	Study Procedures and Personnel - On Page 24 of the application form, the applicants have indicated that the procedure will be performed by the PI or 'a surgeon trained in vascular interventions'. The NREC-MD requests clarification on whether any surgeon(s), other than the PI, may be involved in performing the procedures and requests information to support their inclusion in the study. - The NREC-MD requests clarifications on the following inclusion and exclusion criteria: a. Inclusion criteria number 7 is unclear and potentially subjective b. Exclusion criteria 12 is unclear as it implies presence of two pulmonary issues and should be revised to 'COPD or..' if appropriate. c. Exclusion criteria 12: 'Etc.' is not appropriate in this context. List the types of conditions that fall under the exclusion criteria instead. d. Exclusion criteria 13 is unclear: clarify what populations are considered vulnerable in this context. - The NREC-MD requests clarification on the consenting process. Clarify who will: a. Approach prospective participants b. Discuss the Participant Information Leaflet with them c. Obtain consent. For any individuals other than the PI provide their roles and responsibilities. - While the Committee noted that the PI is committed to the highest standard in research integrity, given the advisory role held by Prof O'Sullivan with the Sponsor, outline what the conflict of interest management plan is for this study. - The Committee noted that there is not an intention to inform participants' GPs of their participation in the study and requests justification. - The Committee noted that a DMC will be included in the study, however there were inconsistencies in the application documentation about the location of the DMC being in the EU and also outside of the EU. Clarify the location of the DMC. **Patient Information Leaflet and Informed Consent Form (PIL/ICF)** - The NREC-MD considered the PIL/ICF and noted that the tone of text is overly positive given the investigative nature of

	the device, eg page 2 and 3 of the PIL, states the device is used 'to treat your condition'. The Committee considers this phrasing to be misleading as this device is investigational and it is not known if it will treat the condition. Reword the sentence to reflect this. - Furthermore, the NREC-MD noted that the PIL/ICF lacks explanation that the study is first in human. The Committee requests that this is stated in the first paragraphs of the PIL/ICF to ensure potential participants have a clear understanding that the study is the first time the device will be used in humans and that they have awareness of the risks involved in such a study. - As there are other devices on the market that can remove clots, the NREC-MD noted that the statement in the PIL/ICF 'current treatments are effective at stopping clots from growing but do not usually remove the clots themselves' is inaccurate and requests its revised for accuracy. - The PIL/ICF lists other treatment options available to prospective participants who chose not to take part in the study, however no reference is made to other clot-removing devices that are on the market. The Committee requests that the alternative treatment options include all appropriate treatment options including other clot-removing devices. - The NREC-MD noted that page 6 of the PIL/ICF states 'your leg could be worsened'. The Committee requests the statement is revised for clarity. - The NREC-MD noted that the PIL/ICF details potential risks associated with participation in the study. However, in the opinion of the Committee, the presentation of the risks that are more frequent than 10% is not helpful as it does not include the upper limit of frequency of occurrence. - The NREC-MD noted that the PIL/ICF would benefit from the risks being presented in a more accessible manner. - As the sedation is necessary component of the study, the risks related to anaesthesia should be listed in the study PIL/ICF. - The Committee noted that the PIL/ICF contained several phrases and references that would be suitable to the American health system but are not appropriate in the Irish setting, eg referring to federal and provincial law. The Committee requests that the PIL/ICF is revised to ensure the text is appropriate for Irish participants. - The PIL includes a reference to anonymised data, however no process for anonymisation is included in the document nor

	there is a consent included for anonymisation. The Committee requests clarification if anonymisation of personal data is part of the study and that the PIL/ICF is revised as applicable. - The Committee noted that there is a reference in the PIL to data being sent overseas, but there is no consent for data being sent outside the EEA. The committee requests clarification on what is meant by data being sent overseas. - For any data that will be sent outside the EU/EEA, the Committee requests that participants are informed through clear explanations in the PIL/ICF and that specific consent for this is sought.
10. 23-NREC-MD-007-SM2	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Dr Matthew Sheehan (National Optometry Centre) • Sponsor: Head Diagnostics Ltd • Study title: Repeatability, Reproducibility and Demographic Reference Study in Ocular Microtremor NREC-MD decision: Favourable
11. 22-NREC-MD-039-SM4	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Prof Gerry O'Sulivan (University Hospital Galway) • Sponsor: Gore • Study title: GORE® VIAFORT Vascular Stent VNS 21-05 NREC-MD decision: Favourable
12. 24-NREC-MD-021-SM1	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Prof Karen Cadoo (St James's Hospital) • Sponsor: Sutro Biopharma • Study title: Diagnostic (Dx) Protocol Title: Diagnostic Protocol for Use of VENTANA FOLR1 (FOLR1-2.1) CDx Assay inSutro Biopharma Study STRO-002-GM3 NREC-MD decision: Favourable
13. 24-NREC-MD-002-SM2	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Prof Karen Cadoo (St James's Hospital) • Sponsor: **No sponsor named on tracker** • Study title: Diagnostic Protocol for Use of VENTANA FOLR1 (FOLR1-2.1) CDx Assay for ImmunoGen for Study IMGN853-0421 NREC-MD decision: Favourable

14. 22-NREC-MD-003-SM5	• Principal Investigator (Lead Institution): Prof Faisal Sharif (University Hospital Galway) • Sponsor: Medtronic • Study title: Global SYMPLICITY Registry (GSR) Denervation Findings in Real World (DEFINE) is referred to as the GSR DEFINE study, Including Irish Country Addendum (IMPROVE) • NREC-MD decision: Request for further information • Further information requested: **In relation to remote consent:** - As this process is currently envisaged to be used in instances where a participant was not properly consented, clarify what measures are in place to minimise this occurring. - How will it be ensured that no undue influence is exerted on the participant to consent to the study, eg in instances where the consent form was deliberately left incomplete by a participant. - How will it be determined that the participants have understood the information and that their questions have been answered. - How will the identity of the participant and the investigator be verified. - How will the discussion between the trial participant and the investigator be captured. - How will the signatures of both the trial participant and investigator be verified. - Clarify if participants will be given the option to have the informed consent process on site if this is the preference of either the participant or the investigator. - Detail the supports available to participants to undertake remote consenting, i.e. IT support. - Detail how the remote consent process complies with the S.I. No 671/2023, GDPR, GCP and the HSE National Policy for Consent in Health and Social Care Research. - Finally, provide an updated CIP reflecting the proposed change to consent process and any phone scripts that might be used in the process.
15. AOB	None

	The Chairperson thanked the Committee and closed the meeting.