Impelling Fasttrack Research review amidst Global Health Emergencies
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Disaster, outbreaks, and health emergencies extend various ethical obstacles related to maintaining quality and standard of care and practices. Often there are no prophylactic regimens available or effective during an emergency such as the Covid-19 pandemic. Since outbreaks of H1N1, Zika, and Ebola, exploring new modalities and treatment plan is a key aspect, and it needs a multidisciplinary ethical review team that accelerates the research review process and hasten to accomplish the project. Globally, every country has its guidelines for research review. But investigating facts during public health emergencies e.g., Covid-19, there is a significant necessity for a fasttrack review system. Focusing more on peer review practices for research on Covid-19 might suggest the upcoming time of peer review system in reviewing research. In an early pandemic situation, an unprecedented surge in the publication in a scholarly journal is a backbreaking task. The documented manuscript entails authenticating its relevance and appropriateness by proceeding through the review process. Enabling a fasttrack review system could be effective in reducing average submission and review time and preventing unnecessary delays in publications. Various questions come to mind- Is it long-lasting? Are we prepared for a fasttrack review of all research? Are we have any guidelines for research review in public health emergencies that provide a uniform and standard review system across the world? Now Fasttrack review implementing mainly for emergencies research projects. It is burdensome to review all research proposals on an emergency basis. Fast tracking all types of research affect the quality of reviewing as well as the overburden to review teams as manpower has limited.

In India, World Health Organization has stated some recommendations in the existing review process for rapid review of research. More emphasis given on using the checklist to ensure the additional requirement necessary during the emergency research process, ethical concerns, involvement of human subjects, availability of relevant literature, and investigator expertise. Various memorandum of association and collaboration needed with funding agencies, study setting, and sponsors to be mandated. The utilization of research findings always needs to clarify the authorship and conflicts of interest. Fastraking research review shifting from in-person to virtual or technology-led platforms increases the additional requirement of setting a system set up for secure and safe research reviewing. Advanced training of members of the review team to work smartly using the technology-based system, sometimes needs experts in IT, so that reviewing process continues without consideration of quality and standards. Meeting with a review team member for strategic planning for fasttrack review also in the virtual platform due to pandemic situation. Principal investigators also have to choose a virtual set for clarification and presentation with the review committee. Sometimes telephonic communication is enough to get a response of related review and any modification. Ethical consideration without affecting standards should be a significant role in the review process. Rapid review needs constant support and the availability of review team members. Many times, higher number of articles received for review with limited time needs to be sorted as per pre-set approved criteria. A fasttrack review system will be more constructive: there is an unprecedented situation happening. Sometimes understanding facts and modifications in therapy and drug, can be done through a fasttrack reviewing of research process. However, there should be no compromise on ethical, and standardize criteria. Ethical bodies should be more proactive to any misleading and fallacious information by investigators or agencies.