

In the real research world, timely and good communication between the investigator and the study participant may avert most potential problems where such requests may be made. This communication should start before the participant signs the consent form, when the researcher explains the trial process, and be continued during the study with the investigator answering questions raised by the participant. In those circumstances where the participant withdraws from the study and insists on knowing their treatment allocation, referral to the Research Ethics Committee or IRB may be prudent. Clinical research guidelines such as the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research¹³ should include principles to assist researchers and regulatory bodies to make clear and transparent decisions in such cases.

References

- Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomized trials. *Ann Intern Med.* 2010;152(11):726-32.
- Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Altman DG. The landscape and lexicon of blinding in randomized trials. *Ann Intern Med.* 2002;136(3):254-9.
- Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gotzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, et al. CONSORT 2010 explanation and elaboration: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMJ.* 2010;340:c869.
- Wood I EM, Gluud LL, Schulz KF, Altman DG, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. *BMJ.* 2008;336:601-5.
- Gotzsche PC. Blinding during data analysis and writing of manuscripts. *Control Clin Trials.* 1996;17(4):285-90; discussion 90-3.
- Dinnett EM, Mungall MM, Kent JA, Ronald ES, McIntyre KE, Anderson E, et al. Unblinding of trial participants to their treatment allocation: lessons from the Prospective Study of Pravastatin in the Elderly at Risk (PROSPER). *Clin Trials.* 2005;2(3):254-9.
- International Conference on Harmonisation. *ICH E6. Good Clinical Practice: Consolidated Guidance 1996* [Internet]. Geneva (CHE): ICH; 2001 [Cited 2012 May 25]. Available from: <http://www.ich.org/>
- Fleming TR, Ellenberg S, DeMets DL. Monitoring clinical trials: issues and controversies regarding confidentiality. *Stat Med.* 2002;21(19):2843-51.
- Walter SD, Awasthi S, Jeyaseelan L. Pre-trial evaluation of the potential for unblinding in drug trials: a prototype example. *Contemp Clin Trials.* 2005;26(4):459-68.
- Jadad AR MR, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJ, Gavaghan DJ, McQuay HJ. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? *Control Clin Trials.* 1996;17(1):1-12.
- Weindling P. The origins of informed consent: the International Scientific Commission on medical war crimes, and the Nuremberg Code. *Bull Hist Med.* 2001;75:37-71.
- Therapeutic Goods Administration. *Note for Guidance on Clinical Safety Data Management: Definitions and Standards for Expedited Reporting (CPMP/ICH/377/95), Annotated with TGA Comments.* Canberra (AUST):TGA; 2000 July.
- National Health and Medical Research Council. *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.* Canberra (AUST): NHMRC; 2007.
- World Health Organisation. Hand book for Good Clinical Practice (GCP): Guidance for Implementation [Internet]. Geneva (CHE): WHO; 2005 [Cited 2012 May 25]. Available from: whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2005/924159392X_eng.pdf
- Therapeutic Goods Administration. *Note for Guidance on Good Clinical Practice (CPMP/ICH/135/95), Annotated with TGA Comments.* Canberra (AUST): TGA; 2000 July.
- National Health and Medical Research Council. *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research.* Canberra (AUST) NHMRC; 2007.
- Australian Law Reform Commission. *For Your Information: Australian Privacy Law and Practice. 3 Part H. Health Services and Research.* Canberra (AUST): ALRC; 2008. p. 2144.
- National Health and Medical Research Council. *Guidelines under Section 95 of the Privacy Act 1988.* Canberra (AUST): NHMRC; 2000. p. 7.

Correspondence to: Dr Fiona Jane, Women's Health Research Program, L6 The Alfred Centre, 99 Commercial Rd, Melbourne, Victoria 3004; e-mail: fiona.jane@monash.edu

Invited Commentary

doi: 10.1111/j.1753-6405.2012.00944.x

There is no ethical dilemma with current RCT participant unblinding practices

Craig Fry

Health Ethics & Policy, Murdoch Childrens Research Institute, Victoria; Centre for Applied Philosophy & Public Ethics; Centre for Health & Society, University of Melbourne, Victoria

In their Editorial, Jane, Davis and Bell argue that a dilemma exists in the case where a randomised controlled trial (RCT) participant requests to be unblinded to their treatment allocation in circumstances other than where a serious adverse event (SAE) has occurred. The authors pose a number of what they regard as key questions about participant and investigator rights and ethics.

Unfortunately, the authors ignore what is surely the most important question here – What is the current need for a generalised right for RCT participants to be unblinded? What do we know about how common such requests are? By not addressing these issues, the authors fail to establish why we would consider such a proposal in the first place.

Successfully arguing a case for a generalised right for RCT participants to be unblinded would require that we first clarify the circumstances beyond adverse events where this may be warranted. The likely uptake of a 'no adverse event unblinding' option, and possible negative effects, would also need to be clarified (e.g. the introduction of participant or investigator bias; potential impact upon participant beliefs about RCT allocation and subsequent in-trial behaviour).

Making such a case in the absence of empirical evidence on these points is difficult. This leaves us with what I think is the central question in this issue – why would an RCT participant request to be unblinded in the absence of SAEs?

The authors acknowledge that requests for unblinding typically occur in the context of serious adverse events. However, they do not present any evidence of other common reasons for unblinding requests in the absence of SAEs. One conceivable justification for such a request might be that some participants are simply curious, and have a preference to be informed of their RCT treatment allocation. That seems reasonable at first glance, but it is difficult to see why such a preference should be satisfied if doing so would undermine trial integrity and outcomes.

Reporting on the meager results of their 1980-2012 Medline search, the authors confirm "there is no mention of the process of unblinding within a study unless for the rare occurrence of a serious adverse event". Without any empirical data to suggest otherwise, this finding is reason enough to conclude that there is no ethical dilemma with current RCT participant unblinding practices.

Correspondence to: Associate Professor Craig Fry, Health Ethics & Policy, Murdoch Childrens Research Institute, Flemington Rd, Parkville, Victoria 3052; e-mail: craiglfry@gmail.com