Revista Bioética
Print version ISSN 1983-8042 On-line version ISSN 1983-8034
Rev. Bioét. vol.28 no.4 Brasília Oct./Dec. 2020
Doi: 10.1590/1983-80422020284429

RESEARCH

Covid-19 research with humans in Brazil

Igor Iuco Castro-Silva[1], *Jacques Antonio Cavalcante Maciel*[1]

1. Universidade Federal do Ceará, Sobral/CE, Brasil.

Abstract

The Covid-19 pandemic challenges research institutions with the urgent need of responding to the morbidity and mortality caused by the virus. This study aimed to overview studies with humans on this disease in the first three months of 2020, in Brazil. Official data of the population and research protocols on Covid-19, distributed by Brazilian states, supported this temporal analysis. The incidence of the virus has grown exponentially, especially in the North and Northeast regions. Despite the discrete, slow, and asymmetric diffusion of studies, they are concentrated in the Southeast, and few clinical trials have entered Phase II. The geographical distribution of research ethics committees, higher education institutions, investments in science and technology, health centers and hospitals generate state vulnerabilities when addressing the disease. Close longitudinal follow-up should be carried out in the face of regional inequities, to defend bioethical principles and human life.
Keywords: Coronavirus. Sars virus. Bioethics. Human experimentation. Clinical trial.

Resumo

Panorama de pesquisas com seres humanos sobre covid-19 no Brasil

A pandemia de covid-19 desafia instituições de pesquisa pela urgência de responder à morbimortalidade provocada pelo vírus. O objetivo deste estudo foi traçar panorama das pesquisas com humanos sobre essa doença no primeiro trimestre de 2020 no Brasil. Dados oficiais de saúde da população e de protocolos de pesquisa sobre a covid-19, distribuídos por estados brasileiros, subsidiaram a análise temporal. Houve crescimento exponencial da incidência do vírus, principalmente nas regiões Norte e Nordeste, apesar da difusão discreta, lenta e assimétrica das pesquisas, concentradas no Sudeste. Os poucos ensaios clínicos entraram na Fase II. A distribuição geográfica de comitês de ética em pesquisa, instituições de ensino superior, investimentos em ciência e tecnologia e unidades assistenciais básicas e hospitalares gera vulnerabilidades estaduais para enfrentar a doença. Acompanhamento longitudinal atento deve ser realizado diante das iniquidades regionais, em defesa dos preceitos bioéticos e da vida humana.
Palavras-chave: Coronavírus. Vírus da Sars. Bioética. Experimentação humana. Ensaio clínico.

Resumen

Panorama de investigaciones con seres humanos sobre covid-19 en Brasil

La pandemia de covid-19 desafía a las instituciones de investigación en la urgencia de responder a la morbilidad y mortalidad causadas por el virus. El objetivo de este estudio fue esbozar una visión general de la investigación con humanos sobre esta enfermedad en el primer trimestre de 2020 en Brasil. Los datos oficiales sobre salud, población y protocolos de investigación sobre covid-19 distribuidos por la unidad federativa brasileña respaldaron un análisis temporal. Hubo un crecimiento exponencial en la incidencia de covid-19, especialmente en las regiones del Norte y Nordeste, a pesar de la diseminación discreta, lenta y asimétrica de la investigación, concentrada en el Sudeste. Los pocos ensayos clínicos estaban en Fase II. La distribución geográfica de los comités de ética de la investigación, las instituciones de educación superior, las inversiones en ciencia y tecnología y las unidades de atención desde la red básica hasta el hospital identificaron los potenciales y vulnerabilidades estatales para hacer frente a la enfermedad. Se debe llevar a cabo un monitoreo longitudinal atento ante las desigualdades regionales, en defensa de los preceptos bioéticos y de la vida humana.
Palabras clave: Coronavirus. Virus del SRAS. Bioética. Experimentación humana. Ensayo clínico.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

With the disease caused by the novel coronavirus (Covid-19), the world faces a public health and civilizing crisis not seen since the Spanish flu of 1918, with a challenging number of contaminations even with the efforts of governments and research institutions [1]. The global geopolitical scenario in the pandemic intensifies economic and social inequalities, as well as the divergence between countries and the World Health Organization (WHO) [2,3]. The U.S. presidential demand, at the beginning of the pandemic, for a rapid Covid-19 vaccine showed discredit in the scientific stages, which require several phases and pre-clinical and clinical studies [4]. Accelerated contamination, high morbidity and mortality, and the absence of pharmacological treatment have made social distancing and biosecurity the only effective weapons against Covid-19 [5].

After three months, the political pressure in Brazil worsened with contradictory discourses on the virus impact, disdain for the high lethality rate of the disease [6,7] and the removal of epidemiological data from official websites [8]. The public repudiation note of the Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science, the Brazilian Academy of Sciences and 70 other entities [9] and the actions of state health departments sought to maintain data transparency on alternative websites and reliability for decision-making [8]. It is important to develop an evidence base to establish better healthcare standards, new interventions, and management guidelines in public health [10].

In 2016, WHO published the *Guidance for managing ethical issues in infectious disease outbreaks* [11] to ensure scientific validity of the rights and safety of participants in studies conducted during outbreaks. The guideline emphasized the moral obligation to conduct timely research, respecting basic ethical principles of studies with human beings [12], such as autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence and justice [13]. This principlism is essential for clinical research, and its perception must be parsimonious to avoid misunderstandings in extreme conditions [14].

Trials include supervisory processes and can be performed quickly without compromising participants' safety, and randomized clinical trials are considered ideal to support causal inference, despite their epistemic limits to address population health and analyze direct harm or benefits to participants [15].

Covid-19 studies involve multiple ethical controversies. The placebo arm of research covers individual physical risks, such as additional pain, suffering or death; in the randomization of the active treatment arm, the benefit is uncertain, and unrecognized damage may occur [10]. Thus, decisions on the prioritization of treatment accentuate discussions in the media and in public debate [16].

With limited resources in the pandemic, the collective benefit is more important than the individual, even though a patient's request for care must be respected, maintaining his autonomy. The impartial distribution of critical respiratory support care, such as mechanical ventilators, is ruled by values that are not usually considered [17]. The protection of justice is under strain, allowing Covid-19 patients with better results to be prioritized over a substantial amount of non-urgent care, which has a negative long-term effect [16].

Thus, the pandemic challenges healthcare systems with an unprecedented number of critically ill patients. Measures to minimize the gap between needs and resources depend on the reduction of viral transmission and increased treatment capacity, which can be made possible by ethical scientific studies [18]. So, this article aimed to trace an initial overview of research on Covid-19 conducted with humans during the first quarter of the pandemic, and potentially innovative factors and assistance to face the disease in Brazil, discussed in the light of current bioethical norms.

Material and methods

This is a quantitative study, with documental analysis of data from the Ministry of Health [19-24], Ministry of Education [25] and Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovations [26] available between March and May 2020, during the first three months of the Covid-19 pandemic in Brazil. Since official and secondary data are used, the bioethical principles of the National Health Council Resolution (CNS) 510/2016 [27] were adopted.

To measure in the country the impact of the disease and studies with humans in progress, research protocols and the subcategory of clinical trials approved in each state was associated with the Covid-19 incidence coefficient, obtained at different periods. The monthly public data provided by the Ministry of Health was collected from the epidemiological bulletins of the National Committee of Ethics in Research (Conep), in three periods: T1 (bulletin 1, of March 23rd, 2020 or

 http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1983-80422020284429

13th epidemiological week)[19], T2 (bulletin 10, of April 24th, 2020 or 17th epidemiological week)[20] and T3 (bulletin 19, of May 26th, 2020 or 22nd epidemiological week)[21].

To determine the Covid-19 incidence coefficient in each state and in the country, the number of confirmed cases[22] was divided by the resident population[23] and multiplied by the population base of 100,000 inhabitants. Simple descriptive analysis was used for the absolute frequency of the number of research protocols and clinical trials approved in each state and in Brazil[19-21].

The clinical trials registered in T3[21] and detailed at *Plataforma Brasil*[24] (Brazil Platform) were categorized according to protocol title, number of participating centers and number of volunteers in Phase I (initial phase, with healthy volunteers, in tens), Phase II (pilot therapeutic study, with target population, in hundreds), Phase III (expanded therapeutic or large randomized studies, multicenter studies, with hundreds to thousands of participants) or Phase IV (post-registration study, pharmacovigilance, with thousands to millions of participants). The relative frequency of clinical trial phases was expressed as a percentage in Figure 1.

To relate this scenario to the infrastructure to fight the virus of each state, two analysis groups were formulated: Category 1, research and innovation; and category 2, research and assistance. The first counted the absolute frequency of research ethics committees (CEP) registered at *Plataforma Brasil*[24], higher education institutions active in the electronic register of the Ministry of Education[25] and the coefficient of investments in science and technology (S&T). This indicator was calculated by the amount of million *reais* invested in S&T, referring to research, development, scientific activities and related techniques, invested in the last year by the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovations[26], divided by the resident population[23] and multiplied by the population base of 100,000 inhabitants. Category 2 recorded data released by the Ministry of Health regarding the absolute frequency of public testing laboratories[22], family health teams[23] and public reference hospitals[22]. Simple descriptive analysis was adopted for absolute data.

Results

Table 1 shows that the Covid-19 incidence coefficient increased exponentially during the first quarter of the pandemic throughout Brazil, especially in the North and Northeast regions. This was accompanied by a slight increase in the number of research protocols on the disease, and approved clinical trials corresponded to a small portion of the total in Brazil (18.4%), mostly in São Paulo.

Table 1. Covid-19 incidence coefficient, research protocols and clinical trials approved in the first trimester of the pandemic, by Brazilian state

	Covid-19 incidence coefficient*			Research protocols			Approved clinical trials		
FU	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3
RO	0.16	13.46	175.89	–	–	–	–	–	–
AC	1.27	26.19	519.26	–	1	2	–	–	1
AM	0.75	68.11	714.16	1	5	6	1	3	3
RR	0.37	54.31	459.69	–	–	–	–	–	–
PA	0.06	14.68	302.21	–	1	2	–	–	1
AP	0.12	65.01	781.10	–	–	–	–	–	–
TO	0.31	2.31	168.57	–	–	–	–	–	–
MA	0.03	24.67	319.98	–	–	–	–	–	–
PI	0.19	6.71	109.77	–	–	2	–	–	–
CE	1.78	50.10	394.24	–	1	7	–	1	1
RN	0.36	19.68	132.26	–	–	3	–	–	–
PB	0.05	8.42	195.61	–	2	5	–	–	–
PE	0.44	36.46	293.93	–	3	9	–	–	–
AL	0.20	9.47	195.40	–	1	3	–	–	–
SE	0.43	5.27	231.61	–	3	3	–	–	–
BA	0.41	11.52	91.50	–	8	18	–	–	–
MG	0.60	6.10	32.45	–	13	29	–	2	4
ES	0.70	32.93	250.44	–	–	1	–	–	–

continues...

Table 1. Continuation

	Covid-19 incidence coefficient*			Research protocols			Approved clinical trials		
FU	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3
RJ	1.37	36.42	231.89	–	17	32	–	7	7
SP	1.62	36.34	181.54	4	89	150	1	18	32
PR	0.49	9.38	28.87	–	9	16	–	1	3
SC	0.94	15.35	94.62	–	2	5	–	–	–
RS	0.75	8.71	57.45	–	15	37	–	–	8
MS	0.75	6.64	36.53	–	1	2	–	–	–
MT	0.06	6.40	43.41	–	1	1	–	1	1
GO	0.33	6.46	35.80	–	2	4	–	–	–
DF	4.13	29.88	215.01	–	3	10	–	1	3
Brazil	0.89	23.34	176.77	5	177	347	2	34	64

**FU: Federation unit; *Population base: 100,000 inhabitants. T1=03/23/2020, T2=04/24/2020, T3=05/26/2020*
Source: Brazil [19-23].

According to Figure 1, of the 64 clinical trials approved until May 2020, 69% were in Phase II, with no authorized national research in Phase IV. It is important to highlight that a study in São Paulo was completely suspended and another study in Amazonas was partially suspended, due to a higher dose arm, after the approval of protocols.

Table 2 presents information on research with human beings related to innovation or assistance. Family health teams are fundamental for the first care of suspected Covid-19 cases, and their number exceeds that of other specialized diagnostic or treatment units in all states. The North region presented the smallest amount of family health teams, and the Southeast region the largest number of higher education institutions, research ethics committees, and investment coefficient in S&T, being an innovation center in the fight against Covid-19.

Figure 1. Covid-19 clinical trials in Brazil in the first quarter of the pandemic



Source: Brazil [21,24].

Table 2. Physical and financial resources involved in research, innovation, and assistance, by federated units and in the country

	Category 1 - Research and innovation			Category 2 - Research and assistance		
FU	Research ethics committees	Higher Education Institution	S&T investment coefficient (R$)*	Public testing laboratories	Family Health Teams	Reference public hospitals
RO	12	36	5.34 mi	1	355	2
AC	3	14	9.17 mi	1	183	1
AM	15	33	4.00 mi	1	692	6
RR	4	10	5.70 mi	1	134	2
PA	21	89	2.21 mi	2	1,494	11
AP	3	16	0.68 mi	1	180	1
TO	10	33	3.65 mi	1	519	1
MA	9	65	2.18 mi	1	2,082	2
PI	12	52	2.52 mi	1	1,297	1
CE	39	117	3.88 mi	1	2,530	1
RN	6	34	6.19 mi	1	1,018	2
PB	16	54	6.56 mi	1	1,453	2

continues...

Table 2. Continuation

FU	Category 1 - Research and innovation			Category 2 - Research and assistance		
	Research ethics committees	Higher Education Institution	S&T investment coefficient (R$)*	Public testing laboratories	Family Health Teams	Reference public hospitals
PE	32	145	3.01 mi	1	2,300	2
AL	5	36	0.88 mi	1	897	1
SE	4	26	3.63 mi	1	651	1
BA	49	179	4.13 mi	1	3,810	1
MG	96	370	5.29 mi	1	5,597	1
ES	15	85	4.35 mi	1	780	2
RJ	69	167	7.81 mi	2	2,295	1
SP	204	696	25.76 mi	1	5,241	1
PR	57	225	11.27 mi	1	2,327	7
SC	37	124	8.10 mi	1	1,825	2
RS	60	148	4.16 mi	1	1,929	2
MS	6	46	5.42 mi	1	629	1
MT	13	71	7.75 mi	1	730	1
GO	26	134	4.40 mi	1	1,541	2
DF	23	95	11.32 mi	1	454	1
Brazil	846	3,100	9.77 mi	29	42,943	58

**FU: Federation unit; *Population base: 100,000 inhabitants; S&T: science and technology*
Source: Brazil [22-26].

Discussion

Research with human beings in Brazil during the pandemic is essential to generate data on the disease and should be based on the ethical principles of CNS Resolution 466/2012 [28]. Other norms in force are continuously improving [29] and have a lot to contribute. For example, CNS Resolution 510/2016 [27] for humanities research, CNS Resolution 553/2017 [30], addressing patients' rights and duties, and CNS *Carta Circular* 166/2018 [31], with a code of conducts for case reports. In addition, CNS Resolution 580/2018 [32] discusses research of strategic interest to the Unified Health System (SUS) and CNS Resolution 588/2018 [33] presents the National Health Surveillance Policy.

The maximum representations of autonomy in clinical studies are the informed consent form and the consent form – a similar document for minors or legally incapable people [28]. In times of social isolation, a major strategy for mitigating Covid-19 in the Brazilian territory [34], obtaining physical signature from participants becomes more difficult, but even surveys with remote data collection must electronically attest their approval or justify their absence, in the case of secondary data [35,36].

Non-maleficence is the idea of not exposing individuals to harm. This reinforces the necessary caution in clinical and Phase II studies, which are still scarce in Brazil, unlike places with a higher history of outbreaks, such as China, where intervention research prevails [12]. So far, no pharmacological risk-free agent has been approved at all stages for treating the virus, but fatal adverse effects have been reported in patients using test drugs [37-40]. Even so, the Brazilian Ministry of Health allowed the use of hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine for critically ill patients [41].

The controversy extended to the international scientific sphere, as a study published in *The Lancet* [42] mistakenly concluded that these drugs were effective. However, the own editors of the journal [43] and 120 scientists [44] from 26 countries – mostly Asian, European and African, a few from Oceania and the Americas, and none from Brazil – spoke out against the false results of the article. Thirteen days after publication, the authors of the article apologized [45], showing that this period of intense global academic debate on the reliability and repercussion of research is important for protecting participants.

The incidence coefficient presented in this study refutes the pandemic denial [46], proving it is a serious public health issue, and that clinical research can assist the population directly or indirectly [28]. But the lack of clear benefits in research protocols on the disease can create conflicts when risks are high, as observed in China in proposals for the use

of Interferon Alfa and traditional medicine, or when the level of biosafety is inadequate [12].

Main decisions based on clinical trials should be entrusted to physicians and experienced teams, who will apply all available resources [2]. In the pandemic, given the high risk of contamination, individual rights of hospitalized patients with Covid-19 are limited, as well as funeral arrangements or necropsy. These measures should be understood as exceptional conditions [47], and new research on the efficacy of medicines, personal protective and supportive equipment can justify practical changes that benefit patients [28,30,32,33].

We emphasize the timid advance of research protocols in Brazil and the importance of continuous investments in S&T, since the scarcity of resources can cause difficult decisions related to beneficence and non-maleficence [16]. The asymmetric distributions of investments, research centers, and assistance verified in this study are inequities in the fight against Covid-19 in Brazil. The country has become one of the epicenters of the disease, whose geographical distribution is marked by interiorization [5], with metropolitan regions spreading the virus to poorer cities in the countryside [48].

The North region was affected later, but the incidence of Covid-19 was high and alarming, with higher risk of healthcare collapse [34,48], which corroborates the findings of this study. Access to different SUS services is a universal and integral right of patients [30] and it must be preserved, regardless of personal decisions to participate in research [32]. Protocols of public health emergencies or with territories or people in situations of great risk or vulnerability [33] require special and urgent analysis, primarily aiming to reduce social and health inequalities [32,33].

Budget forecasting is an important item in care surveys in SUS [32] and health surveillance [33], which legitimizes the discussion about resource sustainability for the well-being of the Brazilian population. Covid-19 creates extremely difficult dilemmas for health professionals, and no isolated algorithm can give complete guidance or relieve the medical burden of individual evaluation, which must weigh between beneficence and justice in particular situations [49].

The recognition of ethical appreciation in public health emergencies generates greater articulation between research institutions, health systems and the community, to prioritize research that improves the well-being and reduces mortality in the short term, especially in contexts of overcrowded hospitals [2,49].

The speed of the evaluation of research on Covid-19 may be positive, as verified by ethics committees in China, where monthly collegiate meetings became almost daily, and decisions began to be released in 2.13 days, on average, with 1.81 more days in case of new submissions during the pandemic [12]. This pattern is much more dynamic than in Brazil, where the average CEP deadline for decisions is 30 days and for Conep is 60 days [29].

A multinational study involving Germany, Italy, Spain, France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria, Denmark, and Sweden showed that each of these countries receives more than 200 clinical trials of drugs per year, mainly in Phase III [50]. The fluctuations over the years were attributed to political influences and commercial sponsorship in Western Europe, with a 4% decrease in proposals between 2007 and 2011, stagnation between 2012 and 2013, and an 10% increase between 2014 and 2015 [50]. In Switzerland, randomized clinical trials cost, on average, US$ 72,000, with different approval intervals when comparing research ethics committees (from 82 to 92 days) and the Swissmedic regulatory agency (27 to 49 days) [36].

In Brazil, these trials depend heavily on the infrastructure of participating centers, and multicentric participation is recommended for lower costs. To develop a new drug, a dossier of clinical development is analyzed in parallel by the CEP/Conep system and regulatory bodies of the National Health Surveillance Agency (Anvisa). Only after the approval of both, the study can begin.

The Anvisa manifestation period varies from 180 days for Phases I or II, or 90 days for the others. Time is relevant in these studies, but it is necessary to consider the safety of volunteers, to guard good research practices [29]. These considerations impact national research on Covid-19, which mostly test chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine, in addition to other therapeutic forms, such as the association with azithromycin, lopinavir/ritonavir, nitazoxanide, eculizumab, tocilizumab, sarilumab, ivermectin, convalescent plasma and mesenchymal stem cells [21].

Suspensions of ongoing trials in Brazil, even in a sample universe that is still small and recent, reinforce the ethics debate during the studies. The "Brazilian way," a cultural construct used as a strategy to solve problems, cannot overlook scientific criteria and the commitment to research quality in the country [51].

In this sense, cunning or *métis*, which refers to ancient Greek thought, arises in the encounter with new challenges, and its flexible psychodynamics reminds us that new operational tactics are always present in human production, but should not disqualify or subvert the quality of knowledge [52]. Considering the immediate search for results during the pandemic, the researcher's role in protecting patients and volunteers against significant risks or damages should be recognized. If damages occur, they should be communicated to research ethics committees for the readjustment or suspension of the study [28].

The limitation of this study is related to the short time interval analyzed, the first trimester of the 2020 pandemic. However, the initial panorama of research with human beings and the dimensioning of S&T resources in Brazil contribute to decision-making in the fight against the disease.

Final considerations

Despite the exponential growth of Covid-19, initial research with humans in Brazil had a discrete, slow, and asymmetric diffusion in the states, with most clinical trials in Phase II. The geographical distribution of resources and assistance generates advances and vulnerabilities in coping with the disease. Close longitudinal follow-up should be carried out in the face of regional inequities, to defend bioethical principles and human life.

References

1. Angelos P. Surgeons, ethics, and covid-19: early lessons learned. J Am Coll Surg [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020];230(6):1119-20. DOI: 10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2020.03.028
2. Arora A, Arora A. Ethics in the age of covid-19. Intern Emerg Med [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020];889-90. DOI: 10.1007/s11739-020-02368-2
3. Hiscott J, Alexandridi M, Muscolini M, Tassone E, Palermo E, Soultsioti M, Zevini A. The global impact of the coronavirus pandemic. Cytokine Growth Factor Rev [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020];53:1-9. DOI: 10.1016/j.cytogfr.2020.05.010
4. Thorp HH. Do us a favor. Science [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020];367(6483):1169. DOI: 10.1126/science.abb6502
5. Maciel JAC, Castro-Silva II, Farias MR. Análise inicial da correlação espacial entre a incidência de covid-19 e o desenvolvimento humano nos municípios do estado do Ceará no Brasil. Rev Bras Epidemiol [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 22 jun 2020];23:E200057. DOI: 10.1590/1980-549720200057
6. Covid-19 in Brazil: "So what?" [editorial]. Lancet [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 23 jun 2020];395(10235):1461. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31095-3
7. Silva R, Pasti D. Da "gripezinha" ao "e daí?": as falas de Bolsonaro em cada fase da pandemia. Gazeta [Internet]. Política; 7 jul 2020 [acesso 8 ago 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/2FKMFKZ
8. Rosário M. Covid-19: sites paralelos divulgam dados oficiais apagados pelo governo. Veja [Internet]. Saúde; 8 jun 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3j9jH56
9. Mais de 70 entidades assinam nota contra ocultação de dados de covid-19 pelo governo. Sociedade Brasileira para o Progresso da Ciência [Internet]. 8 jun 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3jgW9eH
10. Coelho MTP, Rodrigues JFM, Medina AM, Scalco P, Terribile LC, Vilela B *et al*. Exponential phase of covid-19 expansion is driven by airport connections. MedRxiv [Internet]. 6 maio 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020]. DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.02.20050773
11. World Health Organization. Guidance for managing ethical issues in infectious disease outbreaks [Internet]. Geneva: WHO; 2016 [acesso 9 nov 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/37x8pp7
12. Zhang H, Shao F, Gu J, Li L, Wang Y. Ethics committee reviews of applications for research studies at 1 hospital in China during the 2019 novel coronavirus epidemic. JAMA [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020];323(18):1844-6. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2020.4362
13. World Economic Forum. Code of ethics [Internet]. Geneva: WEF; 2018 [acesso 6 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3dN4iWX
14. Kirkpatrick JN, Hull SC, Fedson S, Mullen B, Goodlin SJ. Scarce-resource allocating and patient triage during the covid-19 pandemic: JACC review topic of the week. J Am Coll Cardiol [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020];76(1):85-92. DOI: 10.1016/j.jacc.2020.05.006
15. Meagher KM, Cummins NW, Bharucha AE, Badley AD, Chlan LL, Wright RS. Covid-19 ethics and research. Mayo Clin Proc [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020];95(6):1119-23. DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2020.04.019
16. Herreros B, Gella P, Real de Asua D. Triage during the covid-19 epidemic in Spain: better and worse ethical arguments. J Med Ethics [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020];46(7):455-8. DOI: 10.1136/medethics-2020-106352
17. Rawlings A, Brandt L, Ferreres A, Asbun H, Shadduck P. Ethical considerations for allocation of scarce resources and alterations in surgical care during a pandemic. Surg Endosc [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020]. DOI: 10.1007/s00464-020-07629-x

18. Leclerc T, Donat N, Donat A, Pasquier P, Libert N, Schaeffer E *et al*. Prioritisation of ICU treatments for critically ill patients in a covid-19 pandemic with scarce resources. Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020];39(3):333-9. DOI: 10.1016/j.accpm.2020.05.008
19. Comissão Nacional de Ética em Pesquisa. Boletim Ética em Pesquisa: edição especial coronavírus (covid-19): relatório semanal 1 [Internet]. 23 mar 2020 [acesso 6 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/35hIFu3
20. Comissão Nacional de Ética em Pesquisa. Boletim Ética em Pesquisa: edição especial coronavírus (covid-19): relatório semanal 10 [Internet]. 24 abr 2020 [acesso 6 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/2FP5tc2
21. Comissão Nacional de Ética em Pesquisa. Boletim Ética em Pesquisa: edição especial coronavírus (covid-19): relatório semanal 19 [Internet]. 26 maio 2020 [acesso 6 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/2T9JTBR
22. Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Coronavírus Brasil [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/2HhtitI
23. Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Datasus: Tabnet [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3dPX58D
24. Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Plataforma Brasil [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 6 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/35Z2gzC
25. Brasil. Ministério da Educação. Cadastro Nacional de Cursos e Instituições de Educação Superior: Cadastro e-MEC [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 6 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/38clq7K
26. Brasil. Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovações. Recursos aplicados: governos estaduais: 2.3.4 Brasil: dispêndios dos governos estaduais em ciência e tecnologia (C&T) por região, unidade da federação e atividade, 2000-2017 [Internet]. 2019 [acesso 6 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3kXsybT
27. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. Resolução CNS nº 510, de 7 de abril de 2016. Dispõe sobre as normas aplicáveis a pesquisas em ciências humanas e sociais cujos procedimentos metodológicos envolvam a utilização de dados diretamente obtidos com os participantes ou de informações identificáveis ou que possam acarretar riscos maiores do que os existentes na vida cotidiana. Diário Oficial da União [Internet]. Brasília, nº 98, p. 44, 24 maio 2016 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. Seção 1. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3l0NVJb
28. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. Resolução CNS nº 466, de 12 de dezembro de 2012. Aprova diretrizes e normas regulamentadoras de pesquisas envolvendo seres humanos. Diário Oficial da União [Internet]. Brasília, nº 12, p. 59, 13 jun 2013 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. Seção 1. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3esS2LS
29. Gouy CML, Porto TF, Penido C. Avaliação de ensaios clínicos no Brasil: histórico e atualidades. Rev. bioét. (Impr.) [Internet]. 2018 [acesso 29 maio 2020];26(3):350-9. DOI: 10.1590/1983-80422018263254
30. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. Resolução CNS nº 553, de 9 de agosto de 2017. Aprova a atualização da Carta dos Direitos e Deveres da Pessoa Usuária da Saúde. Diário Oficial da União [Internet]. Brasília, nº 10, p. 41-4, 15 jan 2018 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. Seção 1. Disponível: https://bit.ly/34YM9CR
31. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. Carta circular CNS nº 166, de 12 de junho de 2018 [Internet]. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde; 21 jun 2018 [acesso 26 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3kTy2Em
32. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. Resolução CNS nº 580, de 22 de março de 2018. Regulamenta o disposto no item XIII.4 da Resolução CNS nº 466, de 12 de dezembro de 2012, que estabelece que as especificidades éticas das pesquisas de interesse estratégico para o Sistema Único de Saúde (SUS) serão contempladas em resolução específica, e dá outras providências. Diário Oficial da União [Internet]. Brasília, nº 135, p. 55, 16 jul 2018 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. Seção 1. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3erWgmJ
33. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. Resolução CNS nº 588, de 12 de julho de 2018. Institui a Política Nacional de Vigilância em Saúde. Diário Oficial da União [Internet]. Brasília, nº 155, p. 87-90, 13 ago 2018 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. Seção 1. Disponível: https://bit.ly/2JBy6ei
34. Costa GS, Cota W, Ferreira SC. Metapopulation modeling of covid-19 advancing into the countryside: an analysis of mitigation strategies for Brazil. MedRxiv [Internet]. 13 maio 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. DOI: 10.1101/2020.05.06.20093492
35. Williamson E, Walker AJ, Bhaskaran K, Bacon S, Bates C, Morton CE *et al*. OpenSAFELY: factors associated with covid-19-related hospital death in the linked electronic health records of 17 million adult NHS patients. MedRxiv [Internet]. 7 maio 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. DOI: 10.1101/2020.05.06.20092999
36. Speich B, Schur N, Gryaznov D, Von Niederhäusern B, Hemkens LG, Schandelmaier S *et al*. Resource use, costs, and approval times for planning and preparing a randomized clinical trial before and after the implementation of the new Swiss human research legislation. PLoS ONE [Internet]. 2019 [acesso 29 maio 2020];14(1):e0210669. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0210669
37. Boulware DR, Pullen MF, Bangdiwala AS, Pastick KA, Lofgren SM, Okafor EC *et al*. A randomized trial of hydroxychloroquine as postexposure prophylaxis for covid-19. N Engl J Med [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020];383:517-25. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2016638.X
38. Lane JCE, Weaver J, Kostka K, Duarte-Salles T, Abrahao MTF, Alghoul H *et al*. Safety of hydroxychloroquine, alone and in combination with azithromycin, in light of rapid wide-spread use for covid-19: a multinational, network cohort and self-controlled case series study. MedRxiv [Internet]. 31 maio 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020]. DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.08.20054551

39. Borba MGS, Val FA, Sampaio VS, Alexandre MAA, Melo GC, Brito M *et al*. Chloroquine diphosphate in two different dosages as adjunctive therapy of hospitalized patients with severe respiratory syndrome in the context of coronavirus (Sars-CoV-2) infection: preliminary safety results of a randomized, double-blinded, phase IIb clinical trial (CloroCovid-19 Study). MedRxiv [Internet]. 16 abr 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.07.20056424
40. Rana DRSJB, Dulal S. Therapeutic application of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine in clinical trials for covid-19: a systematic review. MedRxiv [Internet]. 10 abr 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. DOI: 10.1101/2020.03.22.20040964
41. Entenda a liberação de cloroquina e hidroxicloroquina. Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária [Internet]. Novo coronavírus; 31 mar 2020 [acesso 8 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/32geeUf
42. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Ruschitzka F, Patel AN. Hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of covid-19: a multinational registry analysis. Lancet [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020]. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31180-6
43. The Lancet Editors. Expression of concern: hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of covid-19: a multinational registry analysis. Lancet [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020];395(10240):E102. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31290-3
44. Watson J, Adler A, Agweyu A, Prieto-Alhambra D, Amaravadi R, Anaya J-M *et al*. Concerns regarding the statistical analysis and data integrity [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 6 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/2U0vEzP
45. Mehra MR, Ruschitzka F, Patel AN. Retraction: hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of covid-19: a multinational registry analysis. Lancet [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020];395(10240):1820. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31324-6
46. Covid-19: a human rights checklist. Human Rights Watch [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 12 jun 2020]. Disponível: https://bit.ly/2IaSQJ0
47. Calmon M. Considerations of coronavirus (covid-19) impact and the management of the dead in Brazil. Forensic Sci Int [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020];100110. DOI: 10.1016/j.fsir.2020.100110
48. Cota W. Monitoring the number of covid-19 cases and deaths in Brazil at municipal and federative units level. SciELO Preprints [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020];e362. DOI: 10.1590/SciELOPreprints.362
49. Hulsbergen AFC, Eijkholt MM, Balak N, Brennum J, Bolger C, Boher A-M *et al*. Ethical triage during the covid-19 pandemic: a toolkit for neurosurgical resource allocation. Acta Neurochir [Internet]. 2020 [acesso 29 maio 2020];162:1485-90. DOI: 10.1007/s00701-020-04375-w
50. Dombernowsky T, Hædersdal M, Lassen U, Thomsen SF. Development in the number of clinical trial applications in Western Europe from 2007 to 2015: retrospective study of data from national competent authorities. BMJ Open [Internet]. 2017 [acesso 29 maio 2020];7(7):e015579. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-015579
51. Farias SA. The Brazilian little way in academia. BAR Braz Adm Rev [Internet]. 2018 [acesso 29 maio 2020];15(1):e180035. DOI: 10.1590/1807-7692bar2018180035
52. Silva JTA, Muniz HP. Considerações sobre a métis, a inteligência astuciosa. Mnemosine [Internet]. 2017 [acesso 29 maio 2020];13(2):309-31. Disponível: https://bit.ly/3l65Azg

Participation of the authors

Igor Iuco Castro-Silva conceived the study and, with Jacques Antonio Cavalcante Maciel, collected and analyzed the data, wrote and revised the article.

Correspondence

Igor Iuco Castro-Silva – Universidade Federal do Ceará. Av. Comandante Maurocélio Rocha Pontes, 100, bloco da pós-graduação CEP 62042-280. Sobral/CE, Brasil.

Igor Iuco Castro-Silva – PhD – igor.iuco@sobral.ufc.br

0000-0003-4815-6357

Jacques Antonio Cavalcante Maciel – PhD – jacques.maciel@sobral.ufc.br

0000-0002-2293-8433

Received: 6.13.2020

Revised: 9.24.2020

Approved: 10. 1.2020

Research